

**Part B State Performance Plan
for
School Years 2005-2006 through 2010-2011**

**Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
Special Education Team**

Amended January 31, 2006
To the US Dept. of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP)

Table of Contents

Overview	1
Monitoring Priority - Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment	
Indicator #1: Graduation Rates.....	6
Indicator #2: Drop-out Rates	17
Indicator #3: Participation and Performance on Statewide Assessments.....	20
Indicator #4: Suspension and Expulsion Rates.....	33
Indicator #5: Educational Placements, Ages 6-21.....	37
Indicator #6: Educational Placements, Ages 3-5.....	42
Indicator #7: Preschool Outcomes	46
Indicator #8: Parent Involvement.....	50
Monitoring Priority - Disproportionality	
Indicator #9: Inappropriate Identification in Special Education	55
Indicator #10: Inappropriate Identification in Disability Categories	58
Monitoring Priority - Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find	
Indicator #11: Eligibility Determined in a Timely Manner	61
Monitoring Priority - Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition	
Indicator #12: Transition Part C to Part B (Preschool).....	63
Indicator #13: Transition Goals, Age 16 and Above.....	66
Indicator #14: Post High School Outcomes	68
Monitoring Priority - Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision	
Indicator #15: General Supervision System.....	71
Table for #15A	78
Table for #15B	83
Table for #15C	84
Indicator #16: Complaint Resolution in a Timely Manner.....	86
Indicator #17: Adjudication of Due Process Hearings in a Timely Manner	88
Indicator #18: Resolution Sessions	90
Indicator #19: Mediation Agreements.....	91
Indicator #20: Timeliness/Accuracy of Data	93
Attachment 1A	97

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development

Background

When the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Elizabeth Burmaster, took office in 2001, she announced her "New Wisconsin Promise" to ensure the opportunity of a quality education for every child in the state. One of the key priorities of the initiative was special education. The New Wisconsin Promise included a commitment to provide effective pupil services, special education, and prevention programs to support learning and development for all students while preventing and reducing barriers to student success.

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) has developed a Continuous Improvement and Focused Monitoring System (CIFMS) to achieve positive results for children with disabilities in Wisconsin while ensuring continued procedural compliance with state and federal laws and regulations. A key principle of an effective continuous improvement and focused monitoring system is input and feedback from a diverse group of stakeholders. To that end, WDPI Special Education Team began working with Dr. W. Alan Coulter, Director of the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) and his staff on the development of CIFMS and the stakeholder process. NCSEAM staff also was engaged to help stakeholders review changes in state law required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) 2004, determine whether or not to apply for waivers of statutory requirements in IDEA 2004 related to paperwork reduction and multi-year individualized education programs (IEPs), and set rigorous and measurable annual targets for the state performance plan (SPP).

On November 6, 2003, the State Superintendent approved the creation of an ad hoc group of stakeholders to advise the WDPI on its Continuous Improvement and Focused Monitoring System. The CIFMS stakeholders (hereafter stakeholders) represent the categories recommended by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) and include parents of children with disabilities, parent advocates, special education administrators, regular education administrators, special education teachers and school board representatives. The stakeholders and their affiliations are as follows:

Brian Anderson, State Superintendent's Council on Special Education
 Special Education Administrator, Appleton Area School District
 Vaunce Ashby, Assistant Principal, Madison Metropolitan School District
 John Ashley, Executive Director, Wisconsin Association of School Boards
 Nissan Bar-Lev, Director of Special Education, Cooperative Educational Service Agency (CESA) #7
 Wisconsin Council of Administrators of Special Services
 Barb Behlen, Director, Regional Service Network, CESA #6
 Sister Patrice Colletti, Disability Rights Advocate
 Cynthia Hirsch, School Parent Liaison/Quality Education Coalition,
 Learning Disabilities Association
 Joanne Huston, Wisconsin Education Association Council
 Phil Knobel, Executive Director, WI-Council of Administrators of Special Services
 Pete Knotek, Special Education Provider, Wisconsin Education Association Council
 Sheri Krause, Wisconsin Association of School Boards
 Julie Lidbury, Special Education Coordinator, Department of Corrections
 Patricia Luebke, Director of Student Services, Wauwatosa School District
 Carolyn Madsen, Special Education Teacher, Green Bay School District
 Donna Miller, Birth-3 Program and Policy Specialist, Department of Health and Family Services
 Donald Rosin, Project Director, Parent Training and Information Center,
 Great Lakes Inter-Tribal Council
 Pat Schaumburg, Special Education Director, Adams-Friendship Area School District
 Jan Serak, Co-Director, Wisconsin Family Assistance Center for Education, Training and Support,
 (FACETS)/Board of Directors, Autism Society of Wisconsin
 Mary Skadah, Coordinator, Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI)

Jeff Spitzer-Resnick, Managing Attorney, Wisconsin Coalition for Advocacy
(Wisconsin's Protection and Advocacy Agency)
Bonnie J. Vander Meulen, Parent Liaison for Special Education-CESA #2, (Dane County)
Joan Wade, Administrator, CESA #6
Patricia Yahle, State Superintendent's Council on Special Education
Director of Special Services, Milwaukee Public Schools

In May 2004, the stakeholders met to review the proposed focused monitoring plan for the 2004-2005 school year. The group had a lengthy discussion on the disproportionality of race/ethnicity in special education (SPP indicators #9 and #10). WDPI staff announced the creation of a Disproportionality Workgroup and discussed the workgroup's continuing review of monitoring processes and policy objectives.

The stakeholders also heard a presentation from staff regarding educational placement options (SPP indicators # 5 and #6). Stakeholders discussed concerns regarding the least restrictive environment and placement options and recommended the WDPI Special Education Team's Data Verification Workgroup focus on ascertaining the accuracy of the special education environment data. Staff announced training would be offered to the field on data verification in the fall of 2004.

The stakeholders heard a presentation regarding pilot monitoring visits to school districts to review the gap in graduation rates between students with disabilities and students without disabilities (SPP indicator #1). The stakeholders discussed trends in the high school graduation gap and the changing methods of calculating the gap over time.

In November 2004, Dr. Coulter and Dr. Sandy Schmitz, Director of Technical Assistance for NCSEAM, presented an overview of continuous improvement and focused monitoring to the stakeholders. The stakeholders discussed several concepts related to the SPP including:

- What constitutes general supervision (SPP indicator #15) and how is compliance to be ensured by a state?
- What is OSEP's model and WDPI's model of general supervision (SPP indicator #15)?
- What is the WDPI's data collection and analysis system (SPP indicators #3 and #20) and does it reflect the importance of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act?
- What is the state's dispute resolution system and does it ensure compliance (indicators #15 – #19)?
- How can the effectiveness of the state's monitoring system be evaluated (indicator #15)?

The stakeholders reviewed trends in statewide assessment data for grades 4, 8, and 10 (SPP indicator #3) and exiting data (graduation and dropout, SPP indicators #1 and #2). In addition, the stakeholders reviewed information and trend data regarding placements of preschool and school-aged children (SPP indicators #5 and #6) and disproportionality (SPP indicators #9 and #10).

The stakeholders determined two priorities for focused monitoring for the 2005-06 school year: 1) the gap in performance on the statewide 8th grade reading test between children with and without disabilities and 2) the gap in graduation rates between students with and without disabilities.

In March and July 2005, the stakeholders met to begin discussing what, if anything, in state law should be revised in light of IDEA 2004 and to determine methods to reach consensus in their decision-making process. Dr. Coulter and Sheila Ellefson, WDPI attorney, presented an overview of the state administration provisions in IDEA 2004. Small groups then reviewed state laws and regulations to determine if they conflicted with the new federal requirements governing the IEP team process, evaluations, benchmarks or short-term objectives, the content of the IEP, the Special Education Performance Report and the special education plan.

On November 20, 2005, the stakeholders met to determine final goals and targets for the SPP. Dr. Sandy Schmitz facilitated the meeting and reviewed Wisconsin's proposed goals and targets as determined by the stakeholders in prior meetings. After reviewing trend data and hearing staff presentations, stakeholders determined intermediate targets for 2005-2006 and six-year goals for 2010-2011 on the three final indicators: rates of suspension/expulsion (indicator #4), preschool environment (indicator #6), and mediation (indicator #19).

On November 10, 2005, WDPI staff presented an overview of the SPP to the State Superintendent's Council on Special Education, the state advisory panel. Three members of the stakeholder group, Pat Yahle, Cynthia Hirsch, and Brian Anderson, are also members of the Council and provide background information on the stakeholder process to the Council. Staff also reviewed the WDPI's plans to collect baseline data for transition, parent involvement and preschool outcomes. Members of the State Superintendent's Council on Special Education as of December 2005 are:

Basimah Abdullah, Private School Representative, Milwaukee
Brian Anderson, Special Education Administrator, Appleton Area School District
Evelyn Azbell, Parent, Phillips
Susan Endress, Parent & WI FACETS, Milwaukee
Gerald Fults, Special Education Teacher, Stanley Boyd School District
Rebecca Groves, Individual with a Disability, Lodi
Cynthia Hirsch, Parent, Sullivan
Mary Hopkins-Best, Coordinating Chair, School of Education, UW-Stout, Menomonie
Individual with a Disability & Parent
Glen Lamping, Parent, Schofield
Kirby Lentz, School Board Official & Parent, Onalaska
Monica Lopez, Parent, Parent Center, Milwaukee Public Schools
Manuel Lugo, Deputy Administrator, Vocational Rehabilitation Division, Department of
Workforce Development & Parent, Madison
June Paul, Section Manager, Bureau of Programs and Policies, Department of Health and Family
Services, Division of Children & Family Services, Foster Care, Madison
Cynthia Squire, Parent, Janesville
Beth Wroblewski, Section Chief, Children's Long Term Services, Department of Health
and Family Services & Parent, Madison
Patricia Yahle (chairperson), Director of Special Services, Milwaukee Public Schools;
Charter Schools

Wisconsin's Education System

During the 2004-2005 school year (baseline data year for the State Performance Plan), 426 public school districts, 12 public charter school districts and two state agencies, the Wisconsin Department of Corrections (DOC) and the Wisconsin Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS), reported special education data to the WDPI. Only one school district in the state, the Milwaukee Public Schools, had an average daily membership (ADM) of over 50,000 students. This district is included in any sampling methodologies described under the 20 indicators in the SPP.

Wisconsin's 12 Cooperative Educational Service Agencies (CESAs) were created in 1964 to provide regional services to school districts that are within their geographical boundaries. Each CESA has a Regional Service Network (RSN) director funded with IDEA discretionary dollars. The RSN provides special education information and training to school districts within its boundaries.

Local control is a term often used to describe public school governance in the state. Wisconsin citizens participate in large numbers in local and state school decisions, even determining through a statewide nonpartisan election who shall serve the people as the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Wisconsin is one of only 14 states that have an elected state superintendent.

Plan Contents

The SPP represents WDPI's six-year plan for improving outcomes of children with disabilities in Wisconsin. Through an Annual Performance Report (APR), WDPI will measure and report on the performance of children with disabilities using the 20 indicators. The SPP is divided into 20 sections--the 20 indicators--which focus on outcomes for students with disabilities. Included with each indicator is baseline data, a description of the data collection system, rigorous and measurable targets, and strategies for improving outcomes.

20 Indicators:

- Indicator #1 deals with high school graduation rates.
- Indicator #2 concerns drop-out rates.
- Indicator #3 includes an analysis of the participation rates and proficiency levels of students with disabilities on statewide assessments.
- Indicator #4 deals with suspension and expulsion rates.
- Indicator #5 analyzes educational placements for students ages 6 to 21.
- Indicator #6 deals with educational placements of children ages 3 to 5.
- Indicator #7 is a new indicator. The WDPI must include its plan under this indicator to gather baseline data on preschool children in three areas: social-emotional skills, the acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy) and the use of appropriate behaviors.
- Indicator #8 is also a new indicator. The WDPI must include its plan under this indicator to gather baseline data on parent involvement.
- Indicator #9 is a new indicator. The WDPI must include its plan under this indicator to gather baseline data on the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education as the result of inappropriate identification.
- Indicator #10 is also a new indicator. The WDPI must include its plan under this indicator to gather baseline data on the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.
- Indicator #11 is a new indicator. WDPI must include its plan under this indicator to gather baseline data on the number of children who were evaluated within 60 days of the district's receipt of parental consent.
- Indicator #12 includes an analysis of the children who transition from Part C to Part B services, specifically whether they are evaluated and served by their third birthdays.
- Indicator #13 is another new indicator. The WDPI must include its plan to gather baseline data on the transition goals in IEPs for youth aged 16 and above.
- Indicator #14 is also a new indicator. WDPI must include its plan to gather baseline data on post high school outcomes.
- Indicator #15 requires WDPI to review its system of general supervision, i.e. monitoring, complaints, and hearings, to determine if noncompliance is corrected in a timely manner.
- Indicator #16 concerns the resolution of complaints by required timelines.
- Indicator #17 covers the timely adjudication of due process hearings.
- Indicator #18 is a new indicator. The WDPI must report on its plan to gather baseline data on the number of due process hearings resolved through settlement agreements.
- Indicator #19 includes an analysis of mediation agreements.
- Indicator #20 concerns the timeliness and accuracy of the WDPI's data collection system.

Dissemination and Implementation of the State Performance Plan

WDPI staff will post the SPP on the Special Education Team's website for public dissemination on December 2, 2005. The WDPI staff will also offer presentations on the SPP at various meetings during the 2005-06 and 2006-07 school years and will publish an executive summary for ease of review. All special education administrators and district administrators will receive an email about the SPP including a link to the plan on the WDPI website. The stakeholders and the State Superintendent's Council on Special Education will review the plan at their first scheduled meetings following the submission of the plan to OSEP on December 2, 2005.

The annual statewide special education leadership conference and the monthly meetings of the RSN will be dedicated to improvement activities related to the indicators. In addition, the WDPI's Special Education Team will develop an internal electronic monitoring system to collect data related to their work on the indicators. WDPI will focus its work during the next six years on activities related to the 20 indicators in the SPP to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

Measurement for youth with IEPs should be the same measurement as for all youth. Explain calculation.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**Regular Diploma**

The requirements for obtaining a regular diploma in Wisconsin are the same for students with disabilities and students without disabilities. A graduate is defined as a student who has met the requirements established by a school board for a prescribed course of study.

Wisconsin statute 118.33(1)(a) defines the requirements for receipt of a high school diploma as: except as provided in 118.33(1)(d) (see below), a school board may not grant a high school diploma to any pupil unless the pupil has earned:

1. In the high school grades, at least 4 credits of English including writing composition, 3 credits of social studies including state and local government, 2 credits of mathematics, 2 credits of science and 1.5 credits of physical education.
2. In grades 7 to 12, at least 0.5 credit of health education.

The state superintendent encourages school boards to require an additional 8.5 credits selected from any combination of vocational education, foreign languages, fine arts and other courses.

A school board may identify alternative means to satisfy academic performance criteria under its high school graduation policy. Whatever approaches a school board chooses, it should be clearly stated within the local school board graduation policy and followed by individualized education program (IEP) teams or other staff involved in decisions about a student's academic performance. Under Wisconsin statute 118.33(1)(d), a school board may grant a high school diploma to a pupil who has not satisfied the requirements under 118.33(1)(a) if all of the following apply:

1. The pupil was enrolled in an alternative education program, as defined in s. 115.28(7)(e)1.
2. The school board determines that the pupil has demonstrated a level of proficiency in the subjects listed in par. (a) equivalent to that which he or she would have attained if he or she had satisfied the requirements under par. (a).

Baseline Data:

School Year	Students with Disabilities			All Students		
	# Graduates	# Cohort Dropouts	Graduation Rate	# Graduates	# Cohort Dropouts	Graduation Rate
2002-03	5,260	838	86.26%	63,270	5,626	91.83%

Data Source: Wisconsin School Performance Report

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Wisconsin adopted a new individual student enrollment system (ISES) beginning with the reporting of the 2003-04 school year (SY) graduation and dropout data. Due to technical difficulties with the data collection system, submission of the 2003-04 SY graduation and dropout data was delayed until August

2005. WDPI is in the process of reviewing the 2003-04 SY data. The 2004-05 SY graduation and dropout data are only now being submitted to WDPI. Upon completing the data collection and review, WDPI will meet with the stakeholders to review the targets and goals related to graduation and dropout rates and will submit changes to OSEP.

For the 2002-03 SY, graduation data was collected through the School Performance Report (SPR). The SPR includes an aggregate count of graduates by disability status. The graduation rate is calculated as the number of students who graduated with a regular diploma divided by the number of students who graduated with a regular diploma plus the cohort dropouts. The cohort dropouts are the number of dropouts for a graduating class over four years (i.e., 12th grade dropouts for the graduating year + 11th grade dropouts for the prior year + 10th grade dropouts for 2 years prior + 9th grade dropouts for 3 years prior).

The 1999-2000 SY was the first year in which graduation and dropout data were collected by disability status. As a result, the graduation rate for students with disabilities for that year included only 12th grade cohort dropouts. With each subsequent year, another grade of cohort dropouts was included in the graduation rate calculation. The 2002-03 SY was the first year in which complete cohort dropout data was available (grades 9-12). Consequently, with additional cohort dropouts being included in the graduation rate calculation each year, the graduation rate for students with disabilities has decreased over the past four years.

For the 2002-03 SY, there is a gap of 5.57% between the graduation rate of students with disabilities as compared to the graduation rate for all students. The state's goal is to have students with disabilities graduating at a rate comparable to students without disabilities. Because the graduation rate for all students includes both students with and without disabilities, it is necessary to look at the graduation rate for students without disabilities to get a clear understanding of the graduation gap. For the 2002-03 SY, the graduation rate for students without disabilities was 92.38%. The gap between the graduation rate of students with disabilities relative to students without disabilities is 6.12%.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	89.00% of students with disabilities will graduate with a regular diploma
2006 (2006-2007)	89.8% of students with disabilities will graduate with a regular diploma
2007 (2007-2008)	90.6% of students with disabilities will graduate with a regular diploma
2008 (2008-2009)	91.4% of students with disabilities will graduate with a regular diploma
2009 (2009-2010)	92.2% of students with disabilities will graduate with a regular diploma
2010 (2010-2011)	93.00% of students with disabilities will graduate with a regular diploma

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**Stakeholder Input**

Wisconsin has developed a Continuous Improvement and Focused Monitoring System (CIFMS) to achieve positive results for children with disabilities in Wisconsin while ensuring continued procedural compliance with state and federal laws and regulations. WDPI involves stakeholders in the ongoing development of CIFMS including the identification of priority areas for focused monitoring in Wisconsin. The CIFMS stakeholders analyzed statewide student outcome data to determine that reducing the gap in graduation rates between students with disabilities and students without disabilities should be a priority in Wisconsin.

Under the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), WDPI has set a target graduation rate for all students of 98% by the 2013-2014 SY. With this in mind, stakeholders were presented with two possible options as beginning discussion points when setting the targets. The first option was referred to as "plateau/step." With this option, the current graduation rate would remain consistent for three years before showing an increase. This pattern would then be repeated with the graduation rate remaining consistent for three years before again showing an increase. The final three years would show an increase each year to meet the goal of 98% by the 2013-2014 SY. The other option was referred to as "equal step." With the equal step option, the graduation rate would increase by the same percentage for each school year with the goal being 98% by the 2013-2014 SY. The stakeholders selected the equal step option feeling that with the improvement activities in place the graduation rate for students with disabilities would increase each year.

WDPI uses student outcome data to identify gaps in graduation rates between students with disabilities and students without disabilities in local educational agencies (LEAs). In 2004, the CIFMS stakeholders identified eight student enrollment groups (see chart below) within the state from which a select number of school districts are identified for focused monitoring. WDPI examines districts within the enrollment groups using graduation data as reported by LEAs on the SPR. WDPI uses trend data over a three-year period to identify districts for focused monitoring. The districts within each enrollment group most in need of improvement are selected for focused monitoring. For the 2005-06 school year, districts from enrollment groups 1-3 were identified as most in need of improving the gap in graduation rates between students with disabilities and students without disabilities.

Enrollment group	Enrollment Numbers	Number of districts within enrollment group
1	25,001 +	1
2	10,001 - 25,000	10
3	5,001 - 10,000	16
4	3,001 - 5,000	35
5	2,001 - 3,000	31
6	1,001 - 2,000	105
7	0 - 1,000	228
8	Random	426

**LEA Selection Process for Focused Monitoring Onsite Visits: Graduation Gap
2005-2006 School Year
Data Decision Rules**

- School districts were selected from Enrollment Groups 1, 2, and 3.
- The three most recent years of data reported by LEAs on the SPR was used: 2002-03, 2001-02, 2000-01.
- The graduation gap was determined by subtracting the district's graduation rate of students with disabilities from the graduation rate of students without disabilities.

- Using the graduation gap, districts were ranked within each enrollment group from highest to lowest.
- This process was repeated for three consecutive years, producing a graduation rank for each year. The ranking position for each of the three years were added together and sorted from low to high to identify the final ranking score.
- Districts with the lowest scores within enrollment groups 1-3 were selected to receive a focused monitoring visit.
- In the spring of each school year, individual districts were notified they had been identified for focused monitoring for the following school year.

DPI Graduation Gap Workgroup

As part of the Continuous Improvement and Focused Monitoring System (CIFMS), the special education team has created monitoring workgroups. One of these, the Graduation Gap Workgroup is comprised of eight consultants and two program assistants. The WDPI workgroup has sought and received ongoing technical assistance from Dr. Alan Coulter and the staff from the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM). The primary responsibility of the Graduation Gap Workgroup is to develop and conduct focused monitoring activities around the priority area.

The time required to complete an initial focused monitoring visit in an LEA is approximately three days. The number of days in a district is dependent upon the size of the district. Each focused monitoring team is typically composed of four to eight WDPI staff members including one team leader and members of the Graduation Gap Workgroup. The number of members needed for a monitoring visit varies depending on the size of the LEA. The parent liaison hired by the LEA or the respective cooperative educational service agency (CESA) through the Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI) assists the focused monitoring team in conducting parent surveys and focus groups of parents in the LEA. Focused monitoring efforts are continually evaluated by the WDPI Special Education Team, the CIFMS stakeholders, and the State Superintendent's Council on Special Education. Input is also sought and received from districts that receive a focused monitoring visit. The focused monitoring process is revised based upon an analysis of the feedback.

2004-2005 school year activities included:

First Semester:

- Developed pre-onsite, onsite, and post-onsite monitoring procedures; determined the applicable legal provisions; identified research-based practices to improve graduation rates and reduce dropout rates; identified procedural requirements related to improving graduation rates; identified interim measures of progress toward the goal of improving graduation rates for students with disabilities; developed supporting documents, such as letters, interview questions, online surveys, IEP record review and policy review checklists; developed the process for conducting verification of improvement activities; and developed a process for follow-up with LEAs.
- The Graduation Gap Workgroup has developed a technical assistance document incorporating research-based principles to help districts design strategies to improve their graduation rates.

Second Semester:

- The WDPI piloted onsite visits in two LEAs focusing on the gap in graduation rates between students with disabilities and students without disabilities. The department assessed the effectiveness of pre-onsite and onsite procedures via several methods including: conducting interviews and focus forums; reviewing attendance, graduation, suspension, and expulsion policies and procedures; reviewing IEP records; and surveying parents, staff, and adult students with disabilities via an online survey.
- Following the pilots, participating school district staff, parents, and adult students were asked to evaluate the focused monitoring onsite process. As a result of the feedback, procedures and protocols were revised.
- WDPI selected districts for focused monitoring onsite visits based on the gap in graduation rates between students with disabilities and students without disabilities. These districts were notified they would receive a focused monitoring onsite during the 2005-06 school year.

- The workgroup met with stakeholders to provide them with updates on the two focused monitoring pilots.

2005-2006 school year activities include:

First Semester:

- In collaboration with CESAs #5 and #7, the WDPI conducted focused monitoring data retreats for the districts identified for focused monitoring. This was a new component added to the focused monitoring process to assist districts in analyzing local data and developing hypotheses about their student outcomes. Districts selected for onsite visits were required to attend a focused monitoring data retreat in preparation for the onsite visit.
- The Graduation Gap Workgroup is conducting pilot onsites in three districts. This year the department will assess the effectiveness of the improvement plan process and the technical assistance and follow-up components of the focused monitoring (FM) process. Consultants will assist districts in developing a local improvement plan, provide technical assistance, and conduct ongoing progress monitoring.
- Workgroup members have provided presentations about the FM process to district staff at the State Superintendent's Conference on Special Education and Pupil Services Leadership Issues and the Wisconsin Council of Administrators of Special Services (WCASS) Conferences. This work has been discussed with many other groups as well.

Second Semester:

- Provide technical assistance and monitor implementation of improvement plans in FM districts.
- Share results of focused monitoring visits with stakeholders.
- Evaluate and revise focused monitoring process.
- Using graduation data, identify one district from each enrollment group for focused monitoring for the 2006-2007 SY.
- Conduct FM data retreats in the summer.

The Special Education Plan (SEP) <http://dpi.wi.gov/sped/sepintro.html>

The Special Education Plan (SEP) enacted through Wisconsin Statutes, Chapter 115.77(4), in May 1998, is now in its seventh year. For each school year, all Wisconsin LEAs including charter schools complete an annual SEP and submit it to the WDPI for review and for posting to the WDPI website. The SEP is an internet-based application that includes a narrative and IDEA flow-through and preschool funding mechanism that is completed in approvable form before a district may encumber and expend federal monies. The SEP is a reporting framework for the LEA to demonstrate their district's efforts toward ensuring accountability of special education and to also show continuous improvement over the years. The narrative section of the SEP includes an analysis of ten data elements that are evaluated and aligned with interventions, when needed. One of the data elements requires the LEA to analyze graduation rates for students with disabilities and students without disabilities.

The analysis is reviewed by a department consultant assigned to work with the individual LEA. If the district identifies a problem with the graduation gap, it must provide a statement describing how local staff are addressing this concern. The final approved plan is posted on the department's website for public review.

Statewide Discretionary Projects

The state superintendent awards IDEA discretionary funds annually to school districts and CESAs to carry out statewide systems change projects on behalf of the WDPI. The projects described below are some of the grants funded in the last year.

Regional Service Network (RSN) <http://www.wi-rsn.org/>

The state regional service network (RSN) consists of directors from each of the 12 CESAs. The major focus for the RSN is to provide a comprehensive system of personnel development to assure the quality of personnel and services for children with disabilities. Activities may include resource and technical

assistance, a network of communication, and staff development and program assistance in the areas of planning, coordination, and implementation of special education and related services.

The mission of the RSN is to improve the quality of educational services to students with disabilities through a statewide network of representatives from each CESA in cooperation with WDPI. Each RSN provides a comprehensive system of personnel development that unites communication, staff development, and leadership. The goals of the RSN include:

- To maintain and expand a communication network for purposes of liaison among LEAs, CESAs, the WDPI and others including, but not limited to, parents and related agencies.
- To provide leadership to a continuing statewide initiative to assure a comprehensive staff development program.
- To model teamwork and collaboration in decision making and service delivery to generate creative solutions to mutually defined problems.

The RSN has developed a statewide model for professional development, entitled the Wisconsin Professional Development Model - RSN, that includes collecting and analyzing student data to identify professional development needs; goal setting; selecting content and designing professional development to address identified needs; providing training and learning opportunities, collaboration and implementation; and ongoing data collection and program evaluation. This model reflects the National Staff Development Council's standards for staff development (<http://www.nsdc.org/index.cfm>) and the Wisconsin Educator Standards (<http://dpi.wi.gov/tepd/watsnew.html>).

Chapter PI 34, Wisconsin's Quality Educator Initiative, has established standards for teachers, administrators, and pupil services professionals in Wisconsin. One of the requirements to receive a license as a teacher, administrator, or pupil services professional is that an applicant demonstrate proficient performance in knowledge, skills, and dispositions. One way teachers may renew their license is by successfully completing a professional development plan. The RSN assists teachers, administrators, and pupil services professionals in meeting these standards.

Paraprofessional Training Initiative Grant

The purpose of the statewide Paraprofessional Training Initiative is to promote and support the provision of professional development opportunities for Wisconsin paraprofessionals in order to strengthen their ability to more effectively assist in instruction to increase student learning and performance. The initiative provides a systematic framework whereby paraprofessionals, statewide, may access information pertinent to their field and which further allows them to create a communication network among themselves. A component of the Paraprofessional Training Initiative is a paraprofessional website (<http://www.cesa4.k12.wi.us/paraprof.htm>).

Behavior Grant <http://dpi.wi.gov/sped/ed.html>

Wisconsin school districts and CESAs cite student behavior as a high priority for staff development; new teachers report that classroom management is an area in which they feel least prepared. This IDEA statewide grant focuses on providing Wisconsin school district staff with the skills needed to successfully manage student behaviors in the classroom, particularly disruptive and aggressive student behaviors so that students stay in school and graduate.

2004-2005 school year activities:

- Because children with mental health diagnoses often miss school, fall behind academically, and end up dropping out of school, the statewide behavior grant activities included the development of Mental Health Fact Sheets which include suggestions for school programming to appropriately serve students with disabilities who have mental health diagnoses.
- The Second Annual Behavioral Institute included half-day workshops on improving reading achievement of students with behavioral problems and on improving programming for students with an emotional behavioral disability (EBD).

2005-2006 school year activities:

- The Third Annual Behavioral Institute will focus on improving programming and outcomes for students with behavioral issues.
- A social competence project will systematically study social skills necessary for success and the implications for programming and transition planning for students with EBD.
- Through the behavior grant, WDPI will identify the quality indicators of EBD programs and develop a checklist that can be used to evaluate program effectiveness and suggest areas for improvement, thus improving graduation rates, reducing drop-out rates, and reducing suspension and expulsion rates for the students served.

Wisconsin Statewide Transition Initiative (WSTI) (www.wsti.org)

The Wisconsin Statewide Transition Initiative (WSTI) is a WDPI statewide systems change project that offers a comprehensive approach to providing transition services in the State of Wisconsin. Twelve CESA-based transition coordinators, a project director, and a WDPI transition consultant provide transition support services, information dissemination, and staff development to parents, education professionals, and community agency professionals throughout Wisconsin. WSTI is in its sixth year of implementation. Currently, each of the 12 CESAs receives mini-grants to provide transition services. WSTI also hosts a statewide transition conference each year. WSTI utilizes a two-tiered service delivery model consisting of local school district Transition Action Teams and County Transition Advisory Councils. Point of Entry Manuals are developed for each CESA to identify county agency linkages. Additional school districts and counties are now part of WSTI as a result of funding from the State Improvement Grant (SIG).

WDPI has worked collaboratively with Dr. Ed O'Leary of the Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center to develop technical assistance on the correct implementation of transition requirements in IDEA. Districts that participate in WSTI receive training in how to review these requirements in IEPs using a transition checklist. An online training program is available for statewide training. Dr. Ed O'Leary and OSEP have recognized Wisconsin's work in the area of transition as a national model.

Wisconsin Assistive Technology Initiative (WATI). (<http://www.wati.org/>)

WATI is a nationally recognized initiative whose mission is to ensure that every child in Wisconsin who needs assistive technology (AT) has equal and timely access to an appropriate evaluation and the provision and implementation of any needed AT devices and services. The primary goal of the initiative is to improve outcomes and results for children and youth with disabilities through the use of assistive technology to access services, school programs and curriculum, and community activities. As a result, activities carried out by the initiative have a positive impact on graduation rates, drop-out rates, and suspension/expulsion rates.

The leadership and work of WATI have been recognized nationally. For example, WATI was instrumental in developing a graphic assistive technology consideration tool to assist IEP teams in ensuring that children have access to appropriate AT devices and services. This tool was disseminated nationally by the National Association of School District Administrators and the National Association of Secondary School Principals to their memberships. This tool was further recognized and selected by the U.S. Dept. of Education, OSEP, as one of the "IDEAs That Work." Other materials including AT assessment manuals, and forms developed by WATI can be found in use in numerous school districts across the country and in seven foreign countries. In addition, these same materials are used in university courses and can be found in college textbooks. The AT assessment materials developed by WATI are used by the two national training programs that provide training leading to national AT certification.

When students have access to and are provided with appropriate AT devices and services they are better able to access and participate in the general curriculum in regular education settings as well as in regular statewide assessments. Consequently, students having access to the general curriculum through AT perform better on statewide assessments. As students perform better and meet with greater success, graduation, drop-out and suspension/expulsion rates are all positively impacted.

WATI is designed specifically to increase the capacity of school districts to provide AT services by making training and technical assistance available to teachers, therapists, administrators, and parents throughout Wisconsin. It accomplishes this by providing not only training and direct technical assistance but also specific strategies to increase the capacity of school districts to provide AT services. These include the development and dissemination of model forms, AT assessment manuals, recommended evaluation procedures, resource guides and other materials, and access to AT for trial use.

WATI has both state-level services and regional services. Regional services are provided by 12 assistive technology consultants located in each of the 12 CESA regions in the state. Activities carried out at the state level include providing support and leadership to the regional AT consultants, providing specialized competency-based training, developing and conducting specialized summer institutes, developing resource guides or other materials for use by school personnel and parents, and arranging special buys of AT products at reduced prices. In addition, a state-level lending library of AT items that is open to all school districts is maintained.

In each CESA, the assistive technology consultants work with staff from the constituent school districts to help them develop and improve their AT services. These regional AT consultants provide training, technical assistance, and support to increase the capacity of school districts to provide effective and efficient AT services. They also have smaller lending libraries of AT available to their school districts.

During the 2004-2005 school year, WATI carried out the following activities:

- Training sessions, summer institutes, and leadership institutes.
- Provided information and technical assistance.
- Published and disseminated AT newsletter to individuals throughout the state.
- Guest lectured and taught courses related to the use of AT to college and university students at seven teacher education training programs.
- Maintained an AT website.
- Made loans of AT materials/devices.
- Disseminated at no cost and sold AT resource products developed by the initiative.
- Arranged special bulk purchase buys of AT software and hardware items at reduced prices.

Goals for the 2005-2006 school year to be carried out by the WATI director, statewide AT consultant and the 12 regional AT specialists include the following:

- Increase awareness of AT by presenting at a minimum of two statewide conferences.
- Increase the knowledge base of individuals who work with youth transitioning from secondary to postsecondary education by conducting a statewide conference that specifically targets these individuals.
- Increase practitioner knowledge and skills by conducting, throughout the school year, AT training sessions and demonstrations targeting special education teachers, speech/language pathologists, occupational and physical therapists, administrators and parents.
- Increase practitioner knowledge and skills by conducting summer institutes.
- Conduct two AT leadership institutes.
- Respond to requests for AT information and technical assistance throughout the school year.
- Publish and disseminate AT newsletters.
- Increase the awareness and knowledge base of college and university students attending teacher education training programs by providing 10 guest lectures and demonstrations related to the use of AT.
- Maintain and update WATI website.
- Increase practitioner and student access to AT devices, software and resource materials by making loans from the state and regional lending libraries.
- Disseminate at no cost and sell AT resource products developed by the initiative.
- Provide at least two bulk purchasing opportunities to school districts at a substantial discount off the regular price.

Reading Excellence and Demonstration of Success Initiative (READS)**(<http://dpi.wi.gov/reads/index.html>)**

The purpose of this statewide initiative is to provide grants to LEAs to enhance the use of comprehensive, evidence-based literacy instruction with all students with a particular emphasis on reducing achievement gaps between economically disadvantaged students, students of color and students with disabilities, and their peers.

Participating districts cultivate a commitment to READS goals through the use of broad-based leadership teams committed to assisting with the coordination and evaluation of READS activities. Schools use READS funds to increase the capacity of staff to provide evidence-based instruction to all students and to implement progress monitoring systems that provide a critical link to adjusting instruction to meet student needs. READS schools clearly recognize that a menu of instructional programs and strategies are needed in order to realize high levels of student literacy. To this end, participating schools use READS funds to increase universal, selected and targeted literacy instruction and intervention options made available to students.

Early Ongoing Collaboration and Assistance (EOCA) (<http://www.eocaschools.org/>)

The EOCA initiative assists Wisconsin schools to establish and sustain the capacity to make systemic improvement and informed decisions needed to reduce barriers to learning and enable all students to experience academic success. Over a three- to five-year period, participating schools develop the means to implement evidence-based educational options for students that are more likely to be sustained over time. The initiative does this by providing a research-based framework and ongoing professional development, technical assistance and expert school-level support needed to help schools implement the framework and increase the use, variety and quality of general education options made available to all children.

Within the EOCA framework, instructional options, professional development and collaborative partnerships help to support all members of the system (teachers, families, others) as they identify and implement strategies that promote positive student outcomes. A triadic prevention model including universal, selected and targeted options serves as the basis for decision making. All students, including students with disabilities, are addressed through the initiative. The EOCA initiative incorporates elements needed to implement “coordinated early intervening services” and documentation of “response to instruction” set forth by IDEA 2004.

Activities:

- EOCA mentors will provide ongoing technical assistance to help schools enhance options to support student learning in general education.
- EOCA mentors will support schools in addressing social emotional and behavioral concerns to meet the needs of students using proactive approaches to behavior challenges.
- EOCA schools will collect suspension and expulsion data as part of the collaborative school initiatives (CSI) evaluation.

Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI) (<http://dpi.wi.gov/sped/parent.html>)

The WSPEI is a WDPI state discretionary project that serves parents, educators, and others interested in parent-educator partnerships for children with disabilities. Two statewide coordinators and 35 CESA-based parent liaisons collaborate with LEA staff, more than a hundred LEA-based parent liaisons, and staff from the Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIC) to facilitate positive relationships between staff and parents of children with disabilities. The majority of the parent liaisons are themselves parents of children with disabilities and are able to assist other parents in deciding what kind of information or assistance they need and to direct them toward school resources, other agencies, training opportunities and informational materials related to families, disabilities and special education. WSPEI is an integral part of a growing statewide network of families, schools, community resources and state agencies that recognizes the need to bridge the gaps between supports in order to improve outcomes for individuals with disabilities.

Beginning in 2005, nine of the eleven largest LEAs were offered mini-grants from WSPEI to identify and train one or more district parent liaisons with ongoing support from the CESA parent liaisons. The remaining two districts, Milwaukee Public Schools and Racine Unified School District, receive direct discretionary funding for parent liaisons as part of their overall special education assistance from WDPI.

WSPEI parent liaisons work closely with other WDPI statewide initiatives, the statewide PTIC, the PTIC for Native American families, and the Milwaukee Community Parent Resource Center (CPRC) to include parents of children with disabilities in the planning and implementation of initiatives at the state and CESA levels. Project parents partner as co-trainers with staff from other initiatives such as WSTI, WATI, Wisconsin Special Education Mediation System (WSEMS) and early childhood to provide parent perspectives in training and engage parents as learners along with staff. Training and networking opportunities specifically for parents to build competence and leadership are also offered across the state through WSPEI each year. The close collaboration of WDPI, WSPEI parent liaisons and PTIC/CPRC staff ensures that educational materials developed for families are consistent with the information provided to LEA staff.

Special Education Data Retreats

(http://www.cesa7.k12.wi.us/schoolimprove/networks/SIS_network/data_retreats_2002.htm)

During the 2003-2004 SY, WDPI in collaboration with CESAs #7 and #5 developed the Special Education Data Retreat Model to provide a unique, structured forum where collaborative teams of special educators, administrators, along with regular educators evaluated their systems for design and delivery of special education and related services. Focused data analysis enabled educators to develop internal accountability leading toward the development of school/district plans to address identified needs and improve student outcomes. Some of the data analyzed includes graduation, dropout, suspension, expulsion, participation and performance on statewide assessments, and educational environments. Data is disaggregated by disability area, gender, and race/ethnicity whenever it is available. Based upon the CESA #7 data retreat model, teams of educators attend a two-day special education data retreat and participate in an eight-step facilitated participatory data analysis process. During the 2004-2005 SY, statewide training was provided to give all Wisconsin school districts the opportunity to analyze their own data by a collaborative staff team, to identify areas of need based on the data analysis, and to work towards a plan to address those needs building/district wide. To accomplish this statewide training, a "Train the Trainers" model was used. A two-day facilitated training was conducted for all RSN directors and school improvement service (SIS) directors in the state. A model set of data was used for training purposes. After the RSN and SIS directors were trained, each CESA conducted trainings for its own school districts. Two follow-up meetings were conducted to provide support and technical assistance to those responsible for conducting special education data retreats.

Other Activities:

Program Support Meetings

Each year, the program consultants on the Special Education Team design and host program support meetings for interested stakeholders, including parents, school district staff, educational administration, paraprofessionals, and higher education faculty. The overarching goal of these program support meetings is to disseminate innovative information and current resources to the field. At these meetings, program consultants typically present information and training aimed at reducing the graduation gap and dropout rates. Specific topics include research-based strategies to increase student engagement, establish a positive school climate, increase options for student learning, and enhance staff knowledge and skills. These opportunities will continue in future years.

Autism Project (<http://dpi.wi.gov/sped/autcatint2.html>)

For more than ten years, WDPI has developed and conducted statewide trainings for school staff in the area of autism. Last year 12 trainings were held in various locations throughout the state; this year four regional trainings will be held. Each of these trainings includes strategies for preventing suspensions and expulsions, obtaining a diploma, and increasing the graduation rates of students with autism.

Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) (<http://www.dpi.wi.gov/sped/tbi.html>)

For the past ten years, the WDPI has directed discretionary dollars toward supporting a statewide project titled "Traumatic Brain Injury: Wisconsin's Response." This project has focused on providing statewide TBI trainings for graduate credit that permit school district staff to maintain extensive and recent training and experience in the area of TBI while fulfilling professional development plans under state requirements; establishing and maintaining a network of regionally-based TBI trainers to provide child-specific training, consultation, and technical assistance to district staff locally; establishing linkages with state teacher education institutions; and developing and updating training materials and resource kits for distribution to the field. The specific intent of each of these efforts has been to provide Wisconsin school district staff with the information and skills they need to successfully address the unique learning and behavioral needs of children with a TBI, thus increasing graduation rates, reducing drop-outs, and reducing suspension and expulsion rates for behaviors due to TBI.

Wisconsin School for the Visually Impaired (WSVI) (<http://www.wcbvi.k12.wi.us/>)

The Wisconsin School for the Visually Impaired (WSVI) and the Wisconsin Center for the Blind and Visually Impaired (WCBVI) work together to serve students across the state who are blind or visually impaired. Students attending WSVI are actively involved in statewide and district wide assessments with the appropriate accommodations. The WCBVI Outreach staff work with students who are not placed at the school to ensure adequate evaluations are completed and service is provided by the school district. There is ongoing outreach consultation with district staff. The graduation rate of students who are blind or visually impaired is similar to their sighted peers. Students receive ongoing support through transition services and are given the opportunity to work with WCBVI Outreach staff in a six-week Summer Employment Program to help prepare them for the adult world. A counselor is available at WSVI to meet with students to address behaviors that may lead to suspension or expulsion and help guide students in decision making. Students are given the opportunity to meet with the counselor one-on-one to help deal with other social issues.

Wisconsin School for the Deaf (WSD) (<http://www.wsd.k12.wi.us/>)

Students who are deaf or hard of hearing graduate from high school at a rate similar to students without disabilities. Supports to students who are deaf or hard of hearing and struggle with school are provided by Wisconsin School for the Deaf (WSD) staff through ongoing outreach consultation with district staff. Behavior specialists and counselors at WSD meet with students to address behaviors that may lead to suspension or expulsion and help guide student decision-making.

Summary

It is anticipated that the activities described above, with some yearly refinement, will continue over the next six years. The specific activities identified, with the addition of others, will continue to be provided so as to enable practitioners to acquire, maintain and improve their knowledge and skills resulting in a decrease in the gap in graduation rate between students with disabilities and students without disabilities statewide.

For additional information and activities that pertain to improving graduation rates, see indicators #2 and #4.

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to the overview section, pages 1-5.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

Measurement for youth with IEPs should be the same measurement as for all youth. Explain calculation.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

A dropout is defined as a student who was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year, was not enrolled at the reporting time of the current school year (third Friday in September), has not graduated from high school or completed a state- or district-approved educational program, and does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions:

- transfer to another school district, private school, or state- or district-approved educational program;
- temporary absence due to expulsion, suspension, or school-excused illness;
- death.

Students who complete the spring semester of the previous school year but are not enrolled by the third Friday in September of the current school year are considered summer dropouts or “no shows.” Summer dropouts are not counted as dropouts for the previous year. A dropout would be counted for the current school year if the student is not re-enrolled by the count date of the following school year.

Baseline Data

School Year	Students with Disabilities			School Year	All Students		
	# Dropouts	Grades 9-12 Enrollment			# Dropouts	Grades 9-12 Enrollment	School Year
2002-03	839	37,494		2002-03	839	37,494	2002-03

Data Sources: Wisconsin School Performance Report, PI-1290 Public Enrollment, December 1 Child Count

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Wisconsin adopted a new individual student enrollment system (ISES) beginning with the reporting of the 2003-04 school year (SY) graduation and dropout data. Due to technical difficulties with the data collection system, submission of the 2003-04 SY graduation and dropout data was delayed until August 2005. WDPI is in the process of reviewing the 2003-04 SY data. The 2004-05 SY graduation and dropout data are currently being submitted to WDPI. Upon completing of the data collection and review, WDPI will meet with the stakeholders to review the targets and goals related to graduation and dropout rates and will submit changes to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP).

For the 2002-03 SY, dropout data was collected through the School Performance Report (SPR). The SPR was an aggregate count of dropouts by disability status. The dropout rate is calculated as the number of dropouts in grades 9-12 divided by the enrollment in grades 9-12. For all students, enrollment was taken from the third Friday in September count, also known as PI-1290. As the PI-1290 was not

disaggregated by disability status, the enrollment for students with disabilities was taken from the December 1 child count.

The 1999-2000 SY was the first year in which dropout data were collected by disability status on the SPR. In comparing the dropout rates from the 1999-2000 SY to the 2002-03 SY, the dropout rate for students with disabilities has decreased from 2.66% to 2.24%. Likewise, the dropout rate for all students has decreased from 2.291% to 1.975%. The dropout gap between students with disabilities and all students has consistently been less than 1% with the gap for the 2002-03 SY being .265%. Improvement activities are targeted at continuing to decrease the dropout rate for students with disabilities.

Stakeholders:

Under the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), the department has set a target dropout rate for all students of 0% by the 2013-2014 SY. With this in mind, stakeholders were presented with two possible options as beginning discussion points when setting the targets. The first option was referred to as "plateau/step." With this option, the current dropout rate would remain consistent for three years before showing a decrease. This pattern would then be repeated with the dropout rate remaining consistent for three years before again showing a decrease. The final three years would show a decrease each year to meet the goal of 0% by the 2013-2014 SY. The other option was referred to as "equal step." With the equal step option, the dropout rate would decrease by the same percentage for each school year with the goal being 0% by the 2013-2014 SY. Stakeholders also looked at a projected trend line.

The 2005-06 target dropout rate of 1.49% reflects the projected dropout rate using the plateau/step option. The 2010-11 target dropout rate of .64% reflects the projected dropout rate using the equal step option. Based on the improvement activities that are in place and the fact that trend data indicate that the dropout rate for students with disabilities is decreasing slightly each year, it is expected that Wisconsin will continue to make steady progress in decreasing the dropout rate for students with disabilities each year.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	1.49% of students with disabilities will drop out
2006 (2006-2007)	1.32% of students with disabilities will drop out
2007 (2007-2008)	1.15% of students with disabilities will drop out
2008 (2008-2009)	.98% of students with disabilities will drop out
2009 (2009-2010)	.81% of students with disabilities will drop out
2010 (2010-2011)	.64% of students with disabilities will drop out

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

The percent of youth with individualized education programs (IEPs) dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the state dropping out of high school is directly related to the percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to the percent of all youth in the state graduating with a regular diploma. When calculating graduation rate, students who dropout of school are included in the denominator. If youth remain in school, the rate of graduation will increase. In addition, early indicators of dropout are high rates of suspension and expulsion.

Activities that focus on dropout prevention are described under indicators #1 (graduation) and #4 (suspension/expulsion).

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to the overview section, pages 1-5.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of districts meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

A. Percent = # of districts meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for the disability subgroup (children with IEPs) divided by the total # of districts in the State times 100.

B. Participation rate =

- a. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed;
- b. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = b divided by a times 100);
- c. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (percent = c divided by a times 100);
- d. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against grade level standards (percent = d divided by a times 100); and
- e. # of children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards (percent = e divided by a times 100).

Account for any children included in a but not included in b, c, d, or e above

Overall Percent = b + c + d + e divided by a.

C. Proficiency rate =

- a. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed;
- b. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with no accommodations (percent = b divided by a times 100);
- c. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured by the regular assessment with accommodations (percent = c divided by a times 100);
- d. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured by the alternate assessment against grade level standards (percent = d divided by a times 100); and
- e. # of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above as measured against alternate achievement standards (percent = e divided by a times 100).

Overall Percent = b + c + d + e divided by a.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**Students with Disabilities and Statewide Assessment**

All students with disabilities are required to participate in state and district assessments. The 1997 and 2004 reauthorizations of IDEA require that "children with disabilities are included in general state and district-wide assessment programs with accommodations, where necessary." In 2002, NCLB further mandated states to implement statewide accountability systems requiring that all students, including students with disabilities, be proficient in math and reading by the 2013-2014 SY. This act also requires LEAs to measure and report on the progress of all students and subgroups of students including race/ethnicity, children with disabilities, economically disadvantaged, and limited English proficient.

Over the past four years, State Superintendent Elizabeth Burmaster has focused the work of the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) around the New Wisconsin Promise (NWP) and a pledge to put our children and their education first. Included in the NWP are goals specific to student achievement, educational accountability, improved reading, and post-school success in becoming actively involved citizens.

Over the past four years, WDPI has seen an increase of students with disabilities who participate in statewide assessment. To assist LEAs, WDPI has offered training opportunities to teachers, administrative staff, and parents around assessment guidelines and accommodations, alternate assessment, and explicit instruction on how to conduct the Wisconsin Alternate Assessment (WAA) for students with disabilities. Two documents, *Educational Assessment and Accountability for all Students* and the *Administrative Guidebook for the Wisconsin Alternate Assessment for Students with Disabilities* provide guidance. An accommodation matrix was developed to assist individualized education program (IEP) teams determine appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities.

The Wisconsin Student Assessment System (WSAS) in grades 4, 8, and 10 consists of state-enhanced standardized tests called the Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Examinations (WKCE) and the standards-based WAA, which includes the WAA-LEP for students with limited English proficiency and the WAA-SwD for students with disabilities. Tests are administered in the fall of the school year. To fulfill the annual review requirements for the current year, schools and districts must meet the criteria for each of the four following required Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) objectives.

Test Participation Objective. Wisconsin's objective for test participation under AYP is 95%. At least 95% of the total number of students enrolled in the tested grades at the time of testing must participate in the reading and mathematics tests. This requirement may be met by a higher participation rate in reading or mathematics, current year or pooled two-year average. The All Student group and each subgroup of sufficient cell size must meet the 95% test participation objective. A district must meet AYP in at least one grade span to meet this AYP objective (elementary grades K-5, middle grades 6-8, and high school grades 9-12) for the tested grades regardless of the actual local grade configurations.

Reading Annual Measurable Objective. The percentage of full academic year (FAY) students tested who scored at or above the "Proficient" level in the current year must be equal to or greater than the Annual Measurable Objective for Reading (67.5% for 2005 - 2007). The All Student group plus each subgroup of sufficient cell size (the cell size in Wisconsin is 50 students with disabilities) must meet the [Annual Measurable Objective for Reading](#) target or fall within the range specified by a 99% confidence interval. A district must meet AYP in at least one grade span to meet this AYP objective.

Mathematics Annual Measurable Objective. The percentage of FAY students tested who scored at or above the "Proficient" level in the current year must be equal to or greater than the Annual Measurable Objective for Mathematics (47.5% 2005 - 2008). The All Student group plus each subgroup of sufficient cell size must meet the [Annual Measurable Objective for Mathematics](#) target or within the range specified by a 99% confidence interval. A district must meet AYP in at least one grade span to meet this AYP objective.

Subgroups smaller than 50 at the school level are evaluated when sufficient cell size is met at the district and/or state levels for accountability purposes. For AYP purposes, schools are evaluated with a snapshot of the data from all the tested grade levels. Beginning in 2004-2005, districts are evaluated at each relevant grade span on results from the tested grades (elementary grades 3-5, middle grades 6-8, and high school grade 10) regardless of the actual local grade configurations.

Other Indicator Objective.

Schools and districts with sufficient cell size must meet the required criteria for the "Other Indicator" or show growth from the prior year.

Schools with graduates use their high school graduation rate. Schools and districts must meet 90% of the statewide rate of 90.8%, which is 82%, or show growth over the prior year. Schools without graduates must meet 90% of the statewide attendance rate of 94.3%, which is 85%, or show growth over the prior year.

A district must meet AYP in at least one grade span to meet this AYP objective.

Schools Designated as "Identified for Improvement" (SIFI). Beginning with 2002-2003 test results, schools or districts are designated as "[identified for improvement](#)" when the school or district fails to make AYP for two consecutive years in the same AYP objective. Schools are evaluated with data from all the tested grade levels; districts are evaluated at each relevant grade span on the results for the tested grade (elementary grades 3-5, middle grades 6-8, and high school grade 10). Once designated as "identified for improvement," the school or district must meet the annual review criteria for two consecutive years in the same AYP objective to be removed from this designation.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):**Wisconsin Measurements****Part B Monitoring Priority Indicator #3**

- A. Percent of districts that meet AYP cell size of 50 that also meet the state's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations, regular assessment with accommodations, alternate assessment against grade-level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.

Meeting AYP in Wisconsin:

Wisconsin calculates AYP at the district level based upon FAY students tested at each of three grade spans: elementary (grades K-5), middle (grades 6-8), and high (grades 9-12). Not all of the state's schools have students enrolled in all three grade spans; union high school districts, for example, enroll students only in the high school span, while the state also has K-4, K-8, and other district configurations. Additionally, a district could meet the cell size for students with disabilities (50) at one or more grade spans, but not necessarily at all grade spans (for example, a district could have 50 FAY tested students with disabilities for grade 4 reading, but only 49 FAY tested for grade 4 mathematics).

Each district was first evaluated as to whether it met Wisconsin's cell size for students with disabilities (50) for each grade span in which it had tested students in 2004-2005. Then, districts meeting cell size were evaluated for whether they met Wisconsin's 2004-2005 annual measurable objectives (AMOs) of 67.5% proficient or advanced in reading and 47.5% proficient or advanced in mathematics.

Districts that met cell size but not the AMOs in reading and mathematics can still make AYP, however, through either a two-year average of proficiency or through the Safe Harbor provision, which requires (a) a 10% reduction in the number of students who are not proficient, and (b) satisfaction of an "other indicator" that is either attendance/graduation or science, depending on the subgroup. Districts can also

meet AYP if they fall short of AMOs in reading and mathematics through the use of confidence intervals as approved by the U.S. Department of Education.

In the table and calculations below, districts are evaluated as to whether they were above the cell size for students with disabilities (50), and also met Wisconsin's AYP requirements for students with disabilities either through (a) being above the AMOs for reading and mathematics, (b) Safe Harbor, or (c) confidence intervals.

Measurement:

A. % of districts meeting the state's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup:

Percent = # of districts, by subject, that met 2004-2005 AYP requirements for SwD, divided by total number of districts that met minimum SwD cell size (50 FAY tested) times 100:

Reading:	$(24/32) * 100 = 75\%$
Math:	$(24/32) * 100 = 75\%$

B. Participation rate:

- a. **# of children with IEPs** in grades assessed (from Fall 2004 WKCE/WAA):
 - Grade 4:** 8,222 (total enrollment in grade 4 = 59,867)
 - Grade 8:** 9,841 (total enrollment in grade 8 = 68,061)
 - Grade 10:** 9,485 (total enrollment in grade 10 = 71,231)
- b. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment w/no accommodations (see below)
- c. # of children with IEPs in regular assessment w/accommodations*
- d. # of children w/IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards**
- e. # of children w/IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards (see below)

*WDPI does not currently track this information, but will begin doing so with the fall 2005 assessment.

** Wisconsin does not have an alternate assessment against grade-level standards.

Grade 4: Reading

# No WSAS:	81	# WAA-SwD:	979	# WKCE	7,108
		# Minimal	127	# Minimal	1,414
		# Basic	259	# Basic	1,937
		# Proficient	482	# Proficient	2,772
		# Advanced	111	# Advanced	985

Overall participation rate, Grade 4 reading:

- a. # of children with IEPs: 8,222
- b. # w/IEP, regular assessment, no accommodations: 7,108
- c. # w/IEP, regular assessment, accommodations: 0
- d. # w/IEP, alternate assessment at grade level: 0
- e. # w/IEP, alternate assessment/alt. standards (WAA-SWD): 979

$$(b + c + d + e)/a$$

$$(7108 + 0 + 0 + 979)/8222 * 100 = \mathbf{98.36\%}$$

Grade 4: Math

# No WSAS:	73	# WAA-SwD:	768	# WKCE:	7,324
		# Minimal	101	# Minimal	2,734
		# Basic	225	# Basic	1,042
		# Proficient	395	# Proficient	2,560
		# Advanced	47	# Advanced	988

Overall participation rate, Grade 4 math:

- a. # of children with IEPs: 8,222
b. # w/IEP, regular assessment, no accommodations: 7,324
c. # w/IEP, regular assessment, accommodations: 0
d. # w/IEP, alternate assessment at grade level: 0
e. # w/IEP, alternate assessment/alt. standards (WAA-SWD): 768

$$(b + c + d + e)/a$$

$$(7324 + 0 + 0 + 768)/8222 * 100 = \mathbf{98.42\%}$$

Grade 8: Reading

# No WSAS:	169	# WAA-SwD:	801	# WKCE	8,856
		# Minimal	113	# Minimal	2,378
		# Basic	175	# Basic	2,205
		# Proficient	361	# Proficient	3,599
		# Advanced	152	# Advanced	674

Overall participation rate, Grade 8 reading:

- a. # of children with IEPs: 9,841
b. # w/IEP, regular assessment, no accommodations: 8,856
c. # w/IEP, regular assessment, accommodations: 0
d. # w/IEP, alternate assessment at grade level: 0
e. # w/IEP, alternate assessment/alt. standards (WAA-SWD): 801

$$(b + c + d + e)/a$$

$$(8856 + 0 + 0 + 801)/9841 * 100 = \mathbf{98.13\%}$$

Grade 8: Math:

# No WSAS:	168	# WAA-SwD:	777	# WKCE:	8,848
		# Minimal	108	# Minimal	3,796
		# Basic	160	# Basic	2,185
		# Proficient	370	# Proficient	2,553
		# Advanced	139	# Advanced	314

Overall participation rate, Grade 8 math:

- a. # of children with IEPs: 9,841
b. # w/IEP, regular assessment, no accommodations: 8,848
c. # w/IEP, regular assessment, accommodations: 0
d. # w/IEP, alternate assessment at grade level: 0
e. # w/IEP, alternate assessment/alt. standards (WAA-SWD): 777

$$(b + c + d + e)/a$$

$$(8848 + 0 + 0 + 777)/9841 * 100 = \mathbf{97.81\%}$$

Grade 10: Reading

# No WSAS:	271	# WAA-SwD:	783	# WKCE	8,426
		# Minimal	114	# Minimal	3,188
		# Basic	151	# Basic	2,378
		# Proficient	338	# Proficient	1,517
		# Advanced	180	# Advanced	1,343

Overall participation rate, Grade 10 reading:

- | | |
|--|-------|
| a. # of children with IEPs: | 9,485 |
| b. # w/IEP, regular assessment, no accommodations: | 8,426 |
| c. # w/IEP, regular assessment, accommodations: | 0 |
| d. # w/IEP, alternate assessment at grade level: | 0 |
| e. # w/IEP, alternate assessment/alt. standards (WAA-SWD): | 783 |

$$(b + c + d + e)/a$$

$$(8426 + 0 + 0 + 783)/9485 * 100 = \mathbf{97.09\%}$$

Grade 10: Math:

# No WSAS:	285	# WAA-SwD:	788	# WKCE:	8,398
		# Minimal	116	# Minimal	4,445
		# Basic	141	# Basic	1,710
		# Proficient	365	# Proficient	2,005
		# Advanced	116	# Advanced	238

Overall participation rate, Grade 10 math:

- | | |
|--|-------|
| a. # of children with IEPs: | 9,485 |
| b. # w/IEP, regular assessment, no accommodations: | 8,398 |
| c. # w/IEP, regular assessment, accommodations: | 0 |
| d. # w/IEP, alternate assessment at grade level: | 0 |
| e. # w/IEP, alternate assessment/alt. standards (WAA-SWD): | 788 |

$$(b + c + d + e)/a$$

$$(8398 + 0 + 0 + 788)/9485 * 100 = \mathbf{96.85\%}$$

C. Proficiency Rates:

- # of children with IEPs in grades assessed (from Fall 2004 WKCE/WAA):

Grade 4:	8,222 (total enrollment in grade 4 = 59,807)
Grade 8:	9,841 (total enrollment in grade 8 = 68,061)
Grade 10:	9,485 (total enrollment in grade 10 = 71,231)
- # of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above on regular assessment w/no accommodations (see below)
- # of children with IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above on regular assessment with accommodations (Note: WDPI has no information on this for Fall 2004 assessment; "b" and "c" are combined)
- # of children w/IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above on alternate assessment against grade-level standards (Note: Wisconsin does not have alternate assessment against grade-level standards)

- e) # of children w/IEPs in grades assessed who are proficient or above on alternate assessment against alternate standards (see below)

Formula: $(b + c + d + e)/a$

Grade 4 Reading: $(3,757 + 0 + 0 + 593)/8,222 * 100 = 52.91\%$

$$b = 2772 + 985 = 3,757$$

$$c = 0$$

$$d = 0$$

$$e = 482 + 111 = 593$$

Grade 4 Math: $(3,548 + 0 + 0 + 442)/8,222 * 100 = 48.53\%$

$$b = 2560 + 988 = 3,548$$

$$c = 0$$

$$d = 0$$

$$e = 395 + 47 = 442$$

Grade 8 Reading: $(4,273 + 0 + 0 + 513)/9,841 * 100 = 48.63\%$

$$b = 3599 + 674 = 4,273$$

$$c = 0$$

$$d = 0$$

$$e = 361 + 152 = 513$$

Grade 8 Math: $(2,867 + 0 + 0 + 509)/9,841 * 100 = 34.31\%$

$$b = 2553 + 314 = 2,867$$

$$c = 0$$

$$d = 0$$

$$e = 370 + 139 = 509$$

Grade 10 Reading: $(2,860 + 0 + 0 + 518)/9,485 * 100 = 35.61\%$

$$b = 1517 + 1343 = 2,860$$

$$c = 0$$

$$d = 0$$

$$e = 338 + 180 = 518$$

Grade 10 Math: $(2,243 + 0 + 0 + 481)/9,485 * 100 = 28.72\%$

$$b = 2005 + 238 = 2,243$$

$$c = 0$$

$$d = 0$$

$$e = 365 + 116 = 481$$

Stakeholders' decisions:

The stakeholders adopted the AYP targets under NCLB as the targets for the SPP.

Percent of students who score at proficient/advanced for 2004-2005:

Reading: 67.5%

Math: 47.5%

Participation rate:

Reading: 95%

Math: 95%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

WDPI will use separate starting points for reading and mathematics that define the baseline for the minimum percentage of students who are required to meet or exceed the proficient level on academic assessments. The annual measurable objectives and intermediate goals will be applied to all student groups outlined in NCLB sec. 1111(b)(2)(C)(v).

WDPI's annual measurable objectives use the same percent proficient/advanced as the most recent intermediate goal to determine AYP status. The reading and mathematics annual measurable objectives will be applied to each public school and public school district, as well as to each subgroup at the public school and public school district.

Measurable objectives are consistent with intermediate goals, which are consistent with the Wisconsin accountability starting points. Measurable objectives are set to ensure 100% proficiency within the timeline. Measurable objectives and goals are the same for public schools and public school districts, and for all required subgroups of students at all levels (elementary, middle, and high school). WKCE is administered once a year in the fall.

Seventy-five percent of school districts met AYP for reading for the disability subgroup of 50. Within the 32 school districts that met cell size, one district did not meet AYP at the elementary level, three districts did not meet AYP at the middle school level, and two districts did not meet AYP at the high school level. One district did not meet AYP at all three levels, and one district did not meet AYP at middle and high school levels. Twenty-four districts met AYP.

Seventy-five percent of school districts met AYP for math for the disability subgroup of 50. Within the 32 school districts that met cell size, one district did not meet AYP at the middle school level, four districts did not meet AYP at the high school level, and two districts did not meet AYP at the middle and high school levels, and one district did not meet AYP at the elementary, middle, and high school levels. Twenty-four districts met AYP.

Wisconsin's test participation objective is to have 95% of the total number of students enrolled in the tested grades at the time of testing participate in the reading and math tests. Students with disabilities met and surpassed this objective. As indicated above, students with disabilities in 4th grade reading had a participation rate of 98.36% and for math 98.42%. In 8th grade, the participation rate for reading was 98.13% and for math was 97.81%. For 10th grade, the participation rate for reading was 97.09% and for math was 96.85%.

Wisconsin's annual measurable objective for reading is 67.5% and for math is 47.5%. Students with disabilities continue to improve each year but still fall short of meeting these performance objectives. As also indicated above, students with disabilities in 4th grade reading had a proficiency rate of 52.91% and for math 48.53%. In 8th grade the proficiency rate for reading was 48.63% and for math 34.31%. In 10th grade the proficiency rate for reading was 35.61% and for math 28.72%.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	<p>Percent of districts meeting AYP in reading: 75% Percent of districts meeting AYP in math: 75%</p> <p>Participation rate for children in reading: 95% Participation rate for children in math: 95%</p> <p>Proficiency for children in reading: 67.5% Proficiency for children in math: 47.5%</p>

2006 (2006-2007)	Percent of districts meeting AYP in reading: 75% Percent of districts meeting AYP in math: 75% Participation rate for children in reading: 95% Participation rate for children in math: 95% Proficiency for children in reading: 67.5% Proficiency for children in math: 47.5%
2007 (2007-2008)	Percent of districts meeting AYP in reading: 80% Percent of districts meeting AYP in math: 80% Participation rate for children in reading: 95% Participation rate for children in math: 95% Proficiency for children in reading: 74% Proficiency for children in math: 58%
2008 (2008-2009)	Percent of districts meeting AYP in reading: 80% Percent of districts meeting AYP in math: 80% Participation rate for children in reading: 95% Participation rate for children in math: 95% Proficiency for children in reading: 74% Proficiency for children in math: 58%
2009 (2009-2010)	Percent of districts meeting AYP in reading: 80% Percent of districts meeting AYP in math: 80% Participation rate for children in reading: 95% Participation rate for children in math: 95% Proficiency for children in reading: 74% Proficiency for children in math: 58%
2010 (2010-2011)	Percent of districts meeting AYP in reading: 85% Percent of districts meeting AYP in math: 85% Participation rate for children in reading: 95% Participation rate for children in math: 95% Proficiency for children in reading: 80.5% Proficiency for children in math: 68.5%

Data Source:

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

The following activities are designed to assist school districts in improving participation and performance of students with disabilities on state wide assessments.

Wisconsin's Information Network for Successful Schools (WINSS) <http://www.dpi.wi.gov/sig/index.html>

WINSS is an interactive website that provides a broad picture of how students with disabilities compare in achievement to their non-disabled peers. Data on the website indicates growth in not only the numbers of students with disabilities taking the WKCE, but also an increase in the percent of students with disabilities scoring at the proficient and advanced levels. The WINSS Successful School Guide includes the following resources: Standards and Assessment, Continuous School Improvement, Data Analysis, and Best Practices.

Schools Identified for Improvement (SIFI)

Each SIFI school receives a \$50,000 Title 1 supplemental grant to address the area of AYP that was missed. These are two-year grants and every Title 1 SIFI school is eligible. In addition, each of their districts receives an additional amount to support the district's efforts to assist these schools. In 2004, WDPI published the AYP Handbook. It is a quick reference for administrators of schools that were SIFI or missed AYP.

WDPI is developing a statewide system of support to assist school districts with SIFI. This process is currently being piloted with seven districts in four CESAs. The process involves district school improvement staff conducting a self-assessment of support to their neediest schools and the effectiveness of their support. After this self assessment, WDPI supports a review by a team of peers to confirm/revise the conclusions of the self-assessment. The resulting conclusions of district need are the basis for requesting school improvement funds by the district.

WDPI is also developing two toolkits with educators from across the state. One will address adolescent literacy and the other will address adolescent mathematics instruction. They will be completed in the summer of 2006. The toolkits will be added to the WINSS website.

The WDPI is developing a school visit program within Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS). It is a series of structured visits to high performing schools by staff from SIFI to learn how these successful schools are making use of state/district resources to close the achievement gap. These visits will begin in January of 2006. The process will be opened up to non-MPS schools the following school year.

Wisconsin's Continuous Improvement and Focused Monitoring System (CIFMS)

Wisconsin has developed a continuous improvement and focused monitoring system (CIFMS) to achieve positive results for children with disabilities in Wisconsin while ensuring continued procedural compliance with state and federal laws and regulations. WDPI involves stakeholders in the ongoing development of CIFMS including the identification of priority areas for focused monitoring in Wisconsin. The CIFMS stakeholders analyzed statewide student outcome data to determine that reducing the gap in 8th grade reading performance between students with disabilities and students without disabilities should be a priority in Wisconsin.

Each school year, a number of LEAs are selected to receive focused monitoring (FM) based on their decreased proficiency scores on the WKCE 8th Reading assessment. For the 2005-2006 school year, focused monitoring visits are scheduled to three districts in need of improvement. Onsite activities include focus forums and interviews with parents, students, and district staff, review of policies and procedures that pertain to the priority area, and procedural compliance reviews. Feedback from parents, students, and staff who participated in focused monitoring onsite activities has been exceedingly positive. WDPI is providing follow-up support in FM districts. Grant funding through the Early and Ongoing Collaboration and Assistance (EOCA) grant and the Reading Excellence and Demonstration of Success (READS) grant are available to these districts for improvement planning.

The Special Education Plan (SEP) <http://www.dpi.wi.gov/sped/seplan.html>

The Special Education Plan (SEP) enacted through Wisconsin Statutes, Chapter 115.77(4), in May 1998, is now in its seventh year. For each school year, all Wisconsin LEAs including charter schools complete an annual SEP and submit it to the WDPI for review and for posting to the WDPI website. The SEP is an internet-based application that includes a narrative and IDEA flow through and preschool funding mechanism that is completed in approvable form before a district may encumber and expend federal monies. The SEP is a reporting framework for the LEA to demonstrate their district's efforts toward ensuring accountability of special education and to also show continuous improvement over the years. The narrative section of the SEP includes an analysis of ten data elements that are evaluated and aligned with interventions, when needed. One of the data elements is the rate of students with disabilities who participate in statewide and local assessments and the results of the assessments.

Improving AYP for Students with Disabilities <http://www.dpi.wi.gov/sped/ayp.html>.

Some students with disabilities are not meeting the AYP requirements of NCLB. There are statewide, local, and individual efforts and strategies to address this issue and to focus on improving AYP. Some of those may be group efforts in districts, buildings, subject areas, and grade levels. It is also helpful to look at individual student interventions, or smaller group interventions in classrooms. Many of the strategies overlap and are appropriate for students in various disability categories. Strategies are also useful when students with disabilities are preparing to take other standardized tests. The department has provided a document to assist districts to address strategies for improving test participation and maximizing accommodations used as part of accessing a test. The document, *Let's Start Discovering the Answers*, describes strategies to use with students with disabilities.

All documents below are accessible on the WDPI Special Education Team website:

- Let's Start Discovering the Answers
- Adequate Yearly Progress and Assistive Technology
- Adequate Yearly Progress and Autism Spectrum Disorders
- Adequate Yearly Progress and Hearing
- Adequate Yearly Progress and Language & Learning
- Adequate Yearly Progress and Motor/Sensory
- Adequate Yearly Progress and Social/Emotional/Behavioral
- Adequate Yearly Progress and Traumatic Brain Injury
- Adequate Yearly Progress and Vision

Statewide Discretionary Projects

The state superintendent awards IDEA discretionary funds annually to school districts and CESAs to carry out statewide systems change projects on behalf of the WDPI. The projects described below are some of the grants funded in the last year. All grants are expected to be ongoing over the six-year period of the SPP.

Assessment Grant <http://www.dpi.wi.gov/sped/assessmt.html>

The WDPI funds a statewide initiative to narrow the achievement gap and provide tools to assess and document student performance for students with disabilities. Stephen N. Elliott, PhD, with assistance from Andrew T. Roach, PhD., served as consultants to the WDPI for several years with the expressed purpose of providing guidance and expertise around alternate assessment. Dr. Elliott is the Dunn Professor of Educational and Psychological Assessment and Special Education at Vanderbilt University. Dr. Roach is an Assistant Professor of Pediatrics and Special Education at Vanderbilt University. Both previously served at the University of Wisconsin. With their assistance and through this grant, the Wisconsin Alternate Assessment (WAA) for student with disabilities was designed, piloted and refined. The WAA is disseminated at workshops throughout the state and through a WDPI mailing. An Administration Guidebook was developed and continues to be updated. Standard-setting workshops and validity and reliability studies continue to be an integral part of this grant.

Through this grant, the *Assessment Guidelines and Accommodations* matrix was developed to assist districts. A guide for districts, *Education Assessment and Accountability for all Students*, was developed and continues to be updated. Workshops and web casts, including training materials on alternate assessment and accommodations, have been given and continue to be updated. CESA #6 is the grant recipient and coordinates all of the activities.

Behavior Grant

The WDPI funds a statewide initiative that included the following activities:

- a. Summer Behavioral Institute (June 2005 and 2006) with workshops related to improving reading/academic skills for students with behavior problems.
- b. Improving AYP for Students who are EBD - posted to the WDPI website.
- c. Developed documents on using observational data and interviews to assist in gathering information to develop appropriate IEPs and increase positive outcomes for students with disabilities.
- d. Developed presentations on improving programming and outcomes for students with emotional behavioral disabilities (EBD).

Early and Ongoing Collaboration and Assistance (EOCA) Initiative

The EOCA initiative provides the leadership, coordination, and technical assistance designed to help education communities increase the use, variety, and quality of instructional options, professional development, and parent/community involvement. The EOCA initiative incorporates elements needed to implement “coordinated early intervening services” and documentation of “response to instruction” set forth by IDEA 2004.

EOCA began during the 2001-2002 school year as a statewide system change initiative directed at enhancing the success of all students while preventing student failure. The initiative has provided a research-based framework and ongoing professional development; technical assistance and expert school-level support needed to help schools implement the framework and increase the use; and a variety of quality general education options to all children. Over a three- to five-year period, schools implementing the framework develop the means to provide high quality evidence-based educational options for students that are more likely to be sustained over time. EOCA resources include toolkits on School Implementation, Mentor Handbook, Resource Mapping, and a Parent Guide.

Outside evaluation of the initiative has yielded a number of promising results for schools implementing the framework during 2001-2004, including improved achievement of students with disabilities. EOCA evaluation findings between 2000-2004 include the following:

- (1) Third year EOCA pilot schools consistently achieved higher proficiency rates in reading and math achievement than comparison schools.
- (2) Non-white 4th grade students in EOCA pilot schools achieved slightly higher reading and math proficiency rates than those from the comparison schools.
- (3) Reading and math achievement among 4th grade students with disabilities increased at a higher rate than those of comparison schools or the state average.
- (4) After three years, 4th grade students with disabilities in schools implementing the EOCA framework outperformed those from comparison schools in math.
- (5) Achievement gaps between economically advantaged and disadvantaged 4th grade students narrowed substantially between 2002-03 and 2003-04, with proficiency rate differences dropping from 25% to 14% in reading and from 24% to 17% in math.
- (6) The achievement gap between white and non-white students in EOCA pilot schools also narrowed.
- (7) Reading proficiency rate differences between 4th grade white and non-white students decreased from 36% and 23% in 2001-02 and 2002-03, respectively, to a difference of 13.4% in 2003-04.
- (8) Fourth grade math proficiency rates in EOCA pilot schools followed a similar trend, dropping from differences of 39% in 2001-02 to 19% in 2003-04.

Reading Excellence and Demonstration of Success Initiative (READS)

The purpose of this statewide initiative is to provide grants to LEAs to enhance the use of comprehensive, evidence-based literacy instruction with all students with a particular emphasis on reducing achievement gaps between economically disadvantaged students, students of color, and students with disabilities and their peers.

Participating districts cultivate a commitment to READS goals through the use of broad-based leadership teams committed to assisting with the coordination and evaluation of READS activities. Schools use READS funds to increase the capacity of staff to provide evidence-based instruction and to implement progress monitoring systems that provide a critical link to adjust instruction to meet student needs. READS schools clearly recognize that a menu of instructional programs and strategies is needed in order to realize high levels of student literacy. To this end, participating schools use READS funds to increase universal, selected, and targeted literacy instruction and intervention options made available to students.

In addition, when Learning Point Associates evaluated the READS initiative from 1999-2003 they reported that READS helped teachers become better literacy educators, improved students' reading comprehension skills, improved students' writing skills, and helped improve students' phonics skills. Learning Point Associates evaluation found there was steady overall reading growth in READS schools.

Students whose teachers participated in READS activities made an average gain of one Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) point per year over the state average, increased their reading level from the 57th national percentile to the 61st percentile, and 72% of students included in the analysis improved relative to their peers.

Wisconsin Assistive Technology Initiative (WATI) Grant

The WDPI funds a statewide initiative to improve access to assistive technology (AT) by children with disabilities. The primary goal of the initiative is to improve the outcomes and results for children and youth with disabilities through the use of AT to access services, school programs and curriculum in the regular education environments, inclusion of children in the least restrictive environment, participation in regular statewide assessments, etc. When students have access to and are provided with appropriate AT devices and services they are better able to access and participate in the general education curriculum in regular education settings as well as in regular statewide assessments. This grant provides summer institutes, develops resource guides or other materials for use by school personnel and parents, and arranges special buys of AT products at reduced prices. In addition, a state-level lending library of AT items is available.

The leadership and work of WATI have been recognized nationally. WATI was instrumental in developing a graphic assistive technology consideration tool to assist IEP teams in ensuring that children have access to appropriate AT devices and services. This tool was disseminated nationally by the National Association of School District Administrators and the National Association of Secondary School Principals to their memberships. This tool was further recognized and selected by the U.S. Dept. of Education, Office of Special Education Programs as one of the "IDEAs That Work." Other materials including AT assessment manuals, and forms developed by WATI can be found in use in numerous school districts across the country and in seven foreign countries. In addition, these same materials are used in university courses and can be found in college textbooks. The AT assessment materials developed by WATI are used by the two national training programs that provide training leading to national AT certification. WATI staff deliver presentations at local, state, regional and national workshops and conferences. WATI also maintains a website that averages in excess of 100,000 hits each month and has been honored as being in the top 15% of websites run by organizations.

Making Differences Ordinary Math Grant

WDPI has submitted a Department of Education Enhancement Grant entitled, "Making Differences Ordinary." The grant is intended to help in developing programs, practices and policies that are potentially effective for improving student outcomes in mathematics specific to ninth grade. The primary focus of the study is to close the achievement gap in mathematics between students with disabilities and their non-disabled peers. The grant is built on the contention that using the proper teaching pedagogy and challenging mathematical content, special education students can become proficient or advanced in mathematics. Through professional development and technical support the grant will provide WDPI an opportunity to pilot a model of co-teaching between mathematics and special education teachers in six school districts across Wisconsin.

State Residential Schools and Outreach Staff:

The Wisconsin School for the Visually Impaired (WSVI) and the Wisconsin Center for the Blind and Visually Impaired (WCBVI) work together to serve students across the state who are blind or visually impaired. Students attending WSVI are actively involved in statewide and district wide assessments with the appropriate accommodations. The WCBVI Outreach staff works with students who are not placed at the school to ensure adequate evaluations are completed and service is provided by the school district. There is ongoing outreach consultation with district staff.

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to the overview section, pages 1-5.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE
Indicator 4: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and
- B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Measurement:

- A. Percent = # of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year divided by # of districts in the State times 100.
- B. Percent = # of districts identified by the State as having significant discrepancies in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race ethnicity divided by # of districts in the State times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

- A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year

Out of school suspensions are defined as absences from school imposed by the school administration for noncompliance with school district policies or rules, for threatening to destroy school property, or for endangering the property, health, or safety of those at school (see §120.13(1)(b), Wis. Stats.). According to Wis. Stats., s. 118.16(1m), "The period during which a pupil is absent from school due to a suspension or expulsion under s. 120.12 or s. 119.25 is neither an absence without an acceptable excuse for the purposes of sub (1)(a) nor an absence without legal cause for the purposes of sub (1)(c)."

Expulsions are defined as absences from school for purposes of discipline as imposed by the school board for violation of school district rules; threats against school property; or conduct which endangers the property, health, or safety of those at school. Expulsion is a formal school board action defined in Wis. Stats., 120.13 (1)(c), and 119.25 (first-class city school district).

For measurement purposes, the state compared students with disabilities across local educational agencies (LEAs). This was necessary as comparable data of students without disabilities suspended/expelled for more than ten days is not collected. A student may have had a single suspension/expulsion of greater than ten days or may have had multiple suspensions summing to greater than ten days.

- B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity

Both suspension/expulsion and enrollment data are currently collected by race/ethnicity. The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) will expand its analysis of the suspension/expulsion data in relation to race/ethnicity for the 2005-06 school year.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

School Year	# Districts with Significant Discrepancy	Total # of Districts	Percent of Districts with Significant Discrepancy
2004-05	30	439	6.83%

Data Source: School Performance Report and December 1, 2004, child count

Discussion of Baseline Data:

When establishing targets for this indicator, stakeholders looked at the data in a variety of ways including ranking districts by percentage of students with disabilities suspended/expelled for more than ten days and by calculating standard deviation from the mean. Stakeholders chose to set the target for the 2005-06 school year (SY) as 1.75 standard deviations above the mean. This established for identification of significant discrepancy the percentage of students with disabilities suspended/expelled for more than ten days as 2.93% or higher. For future years, 2.93% or higher will be the threshold for identification of significant discrepancy. The goal is to reduce by one school district the number of districts identified each year with significant discrepancy.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	6.6% of districts will be identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than ten days in a school year
2006 (2006-2007)	6.4% of districts will be identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than ten days in a school year
2007 (2007-2008)	6.2% of districts will be identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than ten days in a school year
2008 (2008-2009)	5.9% of districts will be identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than ten days in a school year
2009 (2009-2010)	5.7% of districts will be identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than ten days in a school year

<p>2010 (2010-2011)</p>	<p>5.5% of districts will be identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than ten days in a school year</p>
------------------------------------	---

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Research shows that students with disabilities who are suspended or expelled are more likely to become disconnected from school, fall behind in their class work and achievement, and thus drop out of school and fail to graduate. Because of the correlation among suspension, expulsion, graduation, and dropout rates, the WDPI has designed its continuous improvement and focused monitoring of the graduation gap between students with disabilities and students without disabilities (see indicator #1) to include activities that specifically address LEA suspension and expulsion rates.

Alternatives to suspension, meaningful disciplinary interventions and appropriate services for students with disabilities who may be expelled, are critical to providing those students with a continuing connection to school as well as opportunities to achieve and be successful. These alternatives and interventions, already described in indicator #1, assist school districts in increasing graduation rates and decreasing dropout rates. Activities that specifically address the suspension and expulsion rates of students with disabilities include the following:

- Districts selected for onsite focused monitoring visits are required to attend a data retreat to analyze data patterns, including those related to suspension and expulsion rates for students with disabilities and their nondisabled peers.
- Included within the Graduation Gap Workgroup's onsite focused monitoring activities are procedures and protocols that explicitly probe LEA suspension and expulsion practices. Through focus forums, interviews, and reviews of district suspension and expulsion policies and procedures, the Graduation Gap Workgroup investigates the manner in which LEAs track and analyze suspension/expulsion data and intervene, when appropriate.
- WDPI will develop a plan which includes a review of policies and procedures related to suspension and expulsion in districts identified with significant discrepancy.

The Special Education Plan (SEP)

The Special Education Plan (SEP) enacted through Wisconsin Statutes, Chapter 115.77(4), in May 1998, is now in its seventh year. For each school year, all Wisconsin LEAs, including charter schools, complete an annual SEP and submit it to the WDPI for review and for posting to the WDPI website. The SEP is an internet-based application that includes a narrative and the IDEA flow-through and preschool funding mechanism that is completed in approvable form before a district may encumber and expend federal monies. The SEP is a reporting framework for the LEA to demonstrate their district's efforts toward ensuring accountability of special education and to also show continuous improvement over the years. The narrative section of the SEP includes an analysis of ten data elements that are evaluated and aligned with interventions, when needed. One of the data elements requires the LEA to analyze suspension and expulsion data for students with disabilities and nondisabled students. The analysis is reviewed by a WDPI consultant assigned to work with the individual LEA.

If the district identifies a problem with the suspension and expulsion rates, it provides a statement describing how local staff are addressing this concern. If data reported to the WDPI indicate the local district average for suspension or expulsion rates for children with disabilities deviated by two standard deviations from the state average, the district is placed on a list for further scrutiny. The consultant reviewing the district's special education plan requires the district to respond to the discrepancies by amending the plan to include corrective action if it had previously failed to address problems in the data analysis section. The final approved plan is posted on the WDPI's website for public review.

The WDPI will require LEAs identified during the 2004-2005 SY with significant discrepancies in the rates of suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities for greater than ten days to review and, if appropriate, revise their LEA's policies, procedures, and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of behavioral interventions, and procedural safeguards, and assure WDPI their policies, procedures and practices comply with Part B by April 1, 2006. WDPI will then verify LEA assurances. These LEAs will also be required to include in their 2006-07 special education plans, due July 1, 2006, improvement activities directed at decreasing the number of students with disabilities suspended/expelled for greater than ten days in a school year.

See additional activities and information related to reducing rates of suspensions/expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year under indicators #1 and #2.

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to the overview section, pages 1-5.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 5: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:

- A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;
- B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or
- C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

- A. Percent = # of children with IEPs removed from regular class less than 21% of the day divided by the total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100.
- B. Percent = # of children with IEPs removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day divided by the total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100.
- C. Percent = # of children with IEPs served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements divided by the total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

School district officials have struggled with the meaning of two data concepts: 1) the amount of removal from the regular classroom as reported on Table 3 of the December 1 Federal Student Data Report and 2) the amount of special education a child receives according to his or her individualized education program (IEP). As a result of this confusion, placement data submitted by districts may not have accurately reflected the actual number of children placed in the least restrictive environment. In response to these concerns, the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) created an internal workgroup to train the field on how to ensure the accuracy of the placement /environment data. Data verification efforts described below and under indicator #20 will include further analyses of placement options to determine if IEP teams miscalculate the time of removal for some children due to misunderstandings about what the environment codes represent.

Procedures to Ensure Accuracy of Environment Data:

The WDPI's Federal Student Data Report collects individual student records which form the basis of all the December federal data reports submitted to OSEP. A new internet application was launched in 2002 to replace the diskette collection system. This application was designed to improve the accuracy and efficiency of the data collection for the federal reports. It has proven popular with local educational agencies (LEAs) and has eliminated common problems inherent in the old diskette system.

Each year, WDPI staff offer training on federal data collection at inservice meetings sponsored by software vendors. Hundreds of LEA staff from across the state attend the trainings. Annually, WDPI staff review and update directions and software for the December 1 count and post it to the special education team website.

After all data submitted by districts for the December 1 count is received, a report showing potential duplicate reporting is created. LEAs are contacted and asked to resolve duplicate reporting in February and March of each year. In addition, many edits are incorporated into the software. Several edits address educational environment including a comparison between a child's physical placement location and the environment code assigned. Federal Student Data Report Software validation rules are posted at <http://dpi.wi.gov/sped/pdf/cc-error.pdf>.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):**Environment Ages 6-21**

	Student Count	Total Students	Percent
Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day	55,991	113,225	49.54%
Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day	13,813	113,225	12.20%
Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements	1,636	113,225	1.44%

Data Source: December 1, 2004, child count

Discussion of Baseline Data:

During the 2004-05 school year, nearly half (49.54%) of all children with disabilities ages 6 to 21 were educated for the majority of the school day with their nondisabled peers, the least restrictive environment (LRE) on the continuum of placement options.

As stakeholders analyzed trend data, they noted an increase in the number of children served in the least restrictive environment. Only 43.2% of the students counted on December 1, 2000, were educated for the majority of the school day with their nondisabled peers compared to 49.54% in 2004. This change represents an increase of nearly 6.34% over the last four years in the number of students receiving special education and related services in the least restrictive environment. If trends continue, the number of children served in the least restrictive environment will improve to 60% in 2010-2011.

During the 2004-05 school year, 13.64% of children with disabilities received special education and related services in either separate facilities (served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements) or were removed from the regular class more than 60% of the day (12.20% plus 1.44% equal 13.64%). This number is also an improvement from the December 1, 2000, total of 16.35% for the same two categories. Thus, the number of children who received special education and related services in the most restrictive placements declined over time by approximately 2.71%. Modest decreases in these categories (removal greater than 60% and placements in separate facilities) are expected in the next few years as continuous staff training help LEAs understand the environment codes and improve the accuracy of the data submitted.

It should be noted that the chart above does not include an analysis of the number of children with disabilities removed from the regular class 21% to 60% of the day. 36.82% of children with disabilities receive special education and related services in the regular classroom between 21% and 60% of the day (100% minus 49.54% in the least restrictive categories from the table above minus 13.64% in the last two categories in the table above equals 36.82%).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	<p>Removed from regular class less than 21% of day: 51%</p> <p>Removed from regular class greater than 60% of day: 11.5%</p> <p>Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements: 1.25%</p>

2006 (2006-2007)	Removed from regular class less than 21% of day: 52% Removed from regular class greater than 60% of day: 11.2% Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements: 1.2%
2007 (2007-2008)	Removed from regular class less than 21% of day: 53% Removed from regular class greater than 60% of day: 10.9% Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements: 1.15%
2008 (2008-2009)	Removed from regular class less than 21% of day: 55% Removed from regular class greater than 60% of day: 10.6% Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements: 1.10%
2009 (2009-2010)	Removed from regular class less than 21% of day: 57.5% Removed from regular class greater than 60% of day: 10.3% Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements: 1.05%
2010 (2010-2011)	Removed from regular class less than 21% of day: 60% Removed from regular class greater than 60% of day: 10% Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements: 1%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources

Data Verification Workgroup

WDPI created a Data Verification Workgroup to examine educational environment data and trends over the past three years. The workgroup provided extensive training for directors of special education and data entry personnel on the "Accurate Reporting of Environment Code Data." The workgroup also developed a data verification protocol for school-age environment data with the assistance of the National Center on Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) staff and piloted the process. As a result of pilot visits to school districts, the workgroup acquired information indicating that discrepancies in student placement data did not accurately reflect the amount of removal from regular education classes.

In November 2004, the workgroup produced a statewide Wisline (online) training to increase local district personnel's understanding of the early childhood and school-age environment codes. The training stressed the importance of data accuracy and provided participants with working examples. A Powerpoint presentation of the training was subsequently posted on the WDPI's website to serve as a resource for all school districts. See http://dpi.wi.gov/sped/cc_data.html.

The workgroup is currently modifying and adapting the Appendix B Verification questions from OSEP's continuous improvement and focused monitoring system (CIFMS) accountability manual to use at a local agency level. This effort begins with the collection and reporting of data under section 618 of the IDEA. The workgroup will pilot the adapted Appendix B accountability protocols in two local education agencies in 2005-2006 and will expand the visits to additional school districts in 2007-2011.

Statewide Discretionary Projects

The state superintendent awards IDEA discretionary funds annually to school districts and cooperative educational service agencies (CESAs) to carry out statewide systems change projects on behalf of the WDPI. The projects described below are some of the grants funded in the last year.

Data Retreats

LEAs analyze their data related to education environment during special education data retreats. During the 2003-2004 SY, WDPI in collaboration with CESAs #7 and #5 developed the Special Education Data Retreat Model to provide a unique, structured forum where collaborative teams of special educators, administrators, along with regular educators evaluated their systems for design and delivery of special education and related services. Focused data analysis enabled educators to develop internal accountability leading toward the development of school/district plans to address identified needs and improve student outcomes. Some of the data included education environments, graduation, dropout, suspension, expulsion, and participation and performance on statewide assessments. Data is disaggregated by disability area, gender, and race/ethnicity whenever it is available. Based upon the CESA #7 Data Retreat Model, teams of educators attend a two-day special education data retreat and participate in an eight-step facilitated participatory data analysis process. During the 2004-2005 school year (SY), statewide training was provided to give all Wisconsin school districts the opportunity to analyze their own data by a collaborative staff team, to identify areas of need based on the data analysis, and to work towards a plan to address those needs building/district-wide. To accomplish this statewide training, a "Train the Trainers" model was used. A two-day facilitated training was conducted for all Regional Service Network (RSN) Directors and School Improvement Service (SIS) Directors in the state. A model set of data was used for training purposes. After the RSN and SIS directors were trained, each CESA conducted trainings for their own school districts. Two follow-up meetings were conducted to provide support and technical assistance to those responsible for conducting special education data retreats. (http://www.cesa7.k12.wi.us/schoolimprove/networks/SIS_network/data_retreats_2002.htm)

Wisconsin Assistive Technology Initiative (WATI)

When students have access to and are provided with appropriate assistive technology (AT) devices and services they are better able to access and participate in the general curriculum and in regular education settings. WDPI funds a statewide discretionary initiative to improve access to assistive technology by children with disabilities. The mission of the Wisconsin Assistive Technology Initiative (WATI) is to ensure that every child in Wisconsin who needs AT will have equal and timely access to an appropriate evaluation, and the provision and implementation of any needed AT devices and services. The primary goal of the initiative is to improve outcomes and results for children and youth with disabilities through the use of AT to access services, school programs and curriculum, and community activities.

Goals for the 2005-2006 SY to be carried out by the WATI director, statewide AT consultant, and the 12 regional AT specialists include the following:

- Increase awareness of AT by presenting at a minimum of two statewide conferences that are not devoted specifically to AT (Special Education and Pupil Services Leadership Conference, October 2005; Transition Conference, February 2006; and UW-Oshkosh Special Education Conference, February 2006).
- Increase the knowledge base of individuals who work with youth transitioning from secondary to postsecondary education by conducting a statewide conference that specifically targets these individuals (November 2005).
- Increase practitioner knowledge and skills by conducting, throughout the school year, 300 AT training sessions and demonstrations targeting special education teachers, speech/language pathologists, occupational and physical therapists, administrators and parents.
- Increase practitioner knowledge and skills by conducting at least a five-day summer institute with at least 15 half- and full-day AT workshop offerings (June 2006).
- Increase practitioner knowledge and AT leadership skills by conducting two AT leadership institutes (Fall, 2005 and Spring, 2006).
- Increase practitioner knowledge and skills by responding to requests for AT information and technical assistance throughout the school year.

- Increase awareness and knowledge of AT by publishing and disseminating four issues of the AT newsletter to 1,500 individuals throughout the state (Sept./Oct., 2005; Nov./Dec., 2005; Jan./Feb., 2006; Mar./Apr., 2006; May/June, 2006).
- Increase the awareness and knowledge base of college and university students attending teacher education training programs by providing 10 guest lectures and demonstrations related to the use of AT (ongoing throughout the school year).
- Provide access to timely and relevant information on AT by maintaining and updating monthly the WATI website with a broad array of AT information resources for service providers and parents.
- Increase practitioner and student access to AT devices, software and resource materials by making 2,500 loans from the state and regional lending libraries.
- Increase practitioner knowledge and skills by disseminating at no cost and selling 1,250 AT resource products developed by the initiative.
- Increase student access to AT software and hardware by providing at least two bulk purchasing opportunities to school districts at a substantial discount off the regular price.

It is anticipated that these basic goals with some yearly refinement will guide the initiative over the next six years through the 2010-11 SY.

Outreach Programs: The outreach programs of the Wisconsin Center for the Blind and Visually Impaired and the Wisconsin Educational Services Program for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing provide training and technical assistance to school district staff to enable children with vision and hearing disabilities to be educated in settings with their typically developing peers. The outreach programs employ approximately 20 professional staff who provide support to schools, children, and families statewide.

High Cost Initiative:

As part of the *Keeping the Promise* initiative, the state superintendent set aside High-Cost Special Education Aid funds (IDEA discretionary dollars) to reimburse Wisconsin schools for services to children with severe disabilities. Some of the children served under this initiative included those with hearing impairments. The high-cost funds enabled schools to place and serve hard of hearing and deaf children in their local school districts rather than in state residential facilities.

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to the overview section, pages 1-5.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 6: Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (e.g., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

Percent = # of preschool children with IEPs who received all special education services in settings with typically developing peers divided by the total # of preschool children with IEPs times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

On December 1, 2004, the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) collected data on all children ages 3 through 21 receiving special education and related services under IDEA according to the educational environment in which these services were received. These data provide a measure of the extent to which children with individualized education programs (IEPs) who receive special education and related services are educated in settings with typically developing peers. Educational environment data for children ages 3 through 5 are reported by age, disability, and race/ethnicity. See indicator #5 for a description of the state's data collection system.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

	Student Count	Total Students	Percent
Early childhood setting, home, part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education setting	5,722	15,955	35.86%

Data Source: December 1, 2004, child count

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The figure of 35.86% above represents an increase in the percentage of preschool children with disabilities receiving special education and related services in settings with non-disabled peers. This percentage has gradually been increasing. The availability of preschool service delivery options, particularly in rural areas, may affect future increases. In past annual performance reports (APRs), WDPI commented on anomalies in data reporting. Beginning in 2003, WDPI initiated training to ensure the accuracy of the environment data.

Stakeholders examined trend data and set a target that 50% of children with disabilities ages 3-5 will be educated in settings with typically developing peers by the 2010-2011 school year.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	35.86%

2006 (2006-2007)	38.0%
2007 (2007-2008)	40.0%
2008 (2008-2009)	42.0%
2009 (2009-2010)	44.0%
2010 (2010-2011)	50.0%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

The following statewide initiatives are designed to increase the percentage of children with disabilities ages 3-5 educated with their typically developing peers.

Data Verification Workgroup

WDPI formed a special education Data Verification Workgroup to improve the accuracy of data reporting. The workgroup met with staff from the National Center on Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) to develop data accuracy protocols that were piloted in spring 2005. These protocols were used to verify federal 618 environment data reported by districts to the State. To increase understanding of the environmental codes, the workgroup will continue to provide training to school district staff and vendors of special education reporting software.

The workgroup is currently modifying and adapting the Appendix B Verification questions from OSEP's continuous improvement and focused monitoring system (CIFMS) accountability manual to use at a local agency level. This effort begins with the collection and reporting of data under section 618 of IDEA. The workgroup will pilot the adapted Appendix B accountability protocols in two local education agencies in 2006 and will expand the visits to additional school districts in 2007-2011.

State Improvement Grant (SIG) <http://dpi.wi.gov/sped/sig.html>

Wisconsin's State Improvement Grant (SIG) is designed to build a process that enables families, schools, and communities to work together using effective educational practices that remove barriers and result in improved outcomes for all students, particularly students with disabilities birth through age 21. At the early childhood level, SIG specifically focuses on meeting the goal to ensure that young children with disabilities, birth through 5, receive special education and related services in age appropriate general education settings including home, child care, preschools, Head Start, 4- and 5-year-old kindergarten, and community playgroups. SIG also supports activities to enable regular and special educators to work collaboratively and with families. In addition, SIG established these targets as indicators for success:

1. Fewer than 32% of preschool children with disabilities will be served exclusively in special education settings.
2. 100% of families who have young children with disabilities transitioning from county Birth to 3 early intervention services will be offered and encouraged to have a transition planning conference at least 90 days prior to the child's third birthday.
3. Collaboration among early intervention, childcare, Head Start, and school early childhood programs will increase system level partnerships.

All local educational agencies (LEAs) that receive mini-grants through SIG are required to review and report district data relative to pre-school environment codes as part of the annual accountability reporting. SIG also funds activities at the early childhood level including "Community Collaboration Coaches." These coaches are required to keep track of environment codes as part of their "community logs."

Statewide Discretionary Projects

The state superintendent awards IDEA discretionary funds annually to school districts and cooperative educational service agencies (CESAs) to carry out statewide systems change projects on behalf of the WDPI. The projects described below are some of the grants funded in the last year.

Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (<http://dpi.wi.gov/sped/parent.html>)

The Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI) is a WDPI state discretionary project that serves parents, educators, and others interested in parent-educator partnerships for children with disabilities. Two statewide coordinators and 35 CESA-based parent liaisons collaborate with LEA staff, more than a hundred LEA-based parent liaisons, and staff from the Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIC) to facilitate positive relationships between staff and parents of children with disabilities. The majority of the parent liaisons are themselves parents of children with disabilities and are able to assist parents in deciding what kind of information or assistance they need and to direct them toward school resources, other agencies, training opportunities and informational materials related to families, disabilities and special education. WSPEI is an integral part of a growing statewide network of families, schools, community resources and state agencies that recognizes the need to bridge the gaps between supports in order to improve outcomes for individuals with disabilities.

WSPEI parent liaisons work closely with other WDPI statewide initiatives, the statewide PTIC, the PTIC for Native American families, and the Milwaukee Community Parent Resource Center (CPRC) to include parents of children with disabilities in the planning and implementation of initiatives at the state and CESA levels. Project parents partner as co-trainers with staff from other initiatives such as SIG, the Wisconsin Statewide Transition Initiative (WSTI), the Wisconsin Assistive Technology Initiative (WATI), the Wisconsin Special Education Mediation System (WSEMS) and Early Childhood to provide parent perspectives in training and engage parents as learners along with staff. Training and networking opportunities specifically for parents to build competence and leadership are also offered across the state through WSPEI each year. The close collaboration of WDPI, WSPEI parent liaisons and PTIC/CPRC staff ensures that educational materials developed for families are consistent with the information provided to LEA staff.

Preschool Options Project

The Preschool Options Project is an ongoing statewide systems change project providing training and technical assistance to CESAs, school districts, and communities through sub-grants that focus on expanding service delivery options to young children with disabilities. It is funded with preschool IDEA discretionary funds and SIG funds. See <http://www.wisconsinisig.org/ideaec/ideaecindex.htm>. WDPI disseminated a bulletin on preschool service delivery options and posted it on the agency website. This bulletin has served as the basis for trainings across the state as part of the Preschool Options Project. Web-based resources are available at www.prechooloptions.org, and www.collaboratingpartners.com. A video describing community approaches to expanding preschool delivery of services options has been developed and may be viewed at <http://www.wisconsinisig.org/best/video.htm>.

Ready, Set, Go...Transitions and Options

"Ready, Set, Go...Transitions and Options," is a collaborative effort of the WDPI, Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS)/Birth to 3, WSPEI, Family Assistance Center for Education, Training and Support (FACETS), and the Preschool Options Project. Community training teams have delivered this training statewide. Technical assistance to regional teams and mini-grants to support ongoing training has been established.

Special Education Data Retreats

(http://www.cesa7.k12.wi.us/schoolimprove/networks/SIS_network/data_retreats_2002.htm)

During special education data retreats, LEAs have an opportunity to analyze their education environment data. During the 2003-2004 school year (SY), WDPI in collaboration with CESAs #7 and #5 developed the Special Education Data Retreat Model to provide a unique, structured forum where collaborative teams of special educators, administrators, along with regular educators evaluated their systems for design and delivery of special education and related services. Focused data analysis enabled educators to develop internal accountability leading toward the development of school/district plans to address identified needs and improve student outcomes. The data includes educational environments, graduation, dropout, suspension, expulsion, and participation and performance on statewide assessments. Data is disaggregated by disability area, gender, and race/ethnicity, whenever it is available. Based upon the CESA #7 Data Retreat Model, teams of educators attend a two-day special education data retreat and participate in an eight-step facilitated participatory data analysis process. During the 2004-2005 SY, statewide training was provided to give all Wisconsin school districts the opportunity to analyze their own data by a collaborative staff team, to identify areas of need based on the data analysis and to work towards a plan to address those needs building/district-wide. To accomplish this statewide training, a "Train the Trainers" model was used. A two-day facilitated training was conducted for all Regional Service Network (RSN) Directors and School Improvement Service (SIS) Directors (SIS) in the state. A model set of data was used for training purposes. After the RSN and SIS directors were trained, each CESA conducted trainings for their own school districts. Two follow-up meetings were conducted to provide support and technical assistance to those responsible for conducting special education data retreats.

Outreach Programs

The outreach programs of the Wisconsin Center for the Blind and Visually Impaired and the Wisconsin Educational Services Program for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing provide training and technical assistance to Birth to 3 staff and school district staff to enable preschool-age children with disabilities to be educated in settings with their typically developing peers. The outreach programs employ approximately 20 professional staff. Eight of the outreach staff provide support to schools, children, and families statewide ages Birth to 6.

Speech and Language Pathology

WDPI published *Language Sample Analysis: The Wisconsin Guide Revised* (2005). The guide describes service delivery options for speech and language pathology services in natural settings. WDPI's speech and language consultant will continue to conduct workshops on service delivery alternatives and alternative scheduling to promote inclusive practices.

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to the overview section, pages 1-5.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 7: Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):

- a. Percent of preschool children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = # of preschool children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by # of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improve functioning = # of preschool children who improved functioning divided by # of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = # of preschool children who did not improve functioning divided by # of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.

If children meet the criteria for a, report them in a. Do not include children reported in a in b or c. If a + b + c does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)

- a. Percent of preschool children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = # of preschool children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by # of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning = # of preschool children who improved functioning divided by # of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = # of preschool children who did not improve functioning divided by # of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.

If children meet the criteria for a, report them in a. Do not include children reported in a in b or c. If a + b + c does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:

- a. Percent of preschool children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = # of preschool children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by # of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning = # of preschool children who improved functioning divided by # of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = # of preschool children who did not improve functioning divided by # of preschool children with IEPs assessed times 100.

If children meet the criteria for a, report them in a. Do not include children reported in a in b or c. If a + b + c does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

Describe how data are to be collected so that the State will be able to report entry baseline data in the FFY 2005 APR due February 1, 2007, and targets in the FFY 2006 APR due February 1, 2008. *Sampling of children for assessment is allowed. When sampling will be used, a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates must be submitted to OSEP.*

This is a new indicator for which the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) must describe how data will be collected to report baseline data in February 2007. WDPI has submitted a General Supervision Enhancement Grant (GSEG) in partnership with the Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS) to build a comprehensive Birth-6 longitudinal data system that will inform local and state systems resulting in improved outcomes for young children and their families. This system will be built upon the collaborative efforts of the two state departments that have responsibility for implementation of IDEA Parts B and C, diverse stakeholder groups, and the expertise of our university and community partners. This collaboration is one of the distinctive aspects of WDPI's proposal. The proposal was designed to utilize the resources of the GSEG to accomplish the following goals:

1. Build consensus to develop an accountability measurement method that enables local providers to reliably, efficiently, and consistently collect and report child, family, and program outcome data.
2. Develop a methodology to improve the transition outcomes for children and families as they move between Part C and Part B and create a data system with a single identifier number to better inform state and local providers and schools.
3. Develop a technology solution that bridges existing data systems, provides a mechanism to collect and aggregate child and family outcome data, is responsive to local providers and families, and maintains high levels of confidentiality.
4. Build the state and local infrastructure that includes policies, professional development, and marketing to ensure that data-based decisions result in program improvements.

Accomplishment of these goals will result in outcome indicators for children between Birth and 5 and a web-based system to collect, analyze, and utilize data to improve programs, services, and outcomes for children and families.

Data Collection Plan

To measure early childhood outcomes, pilot and phase-in procedures will be utilized. The design will comply with the guidance from OSEP, the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Center, and the National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC). WDPI has participated in conference calls and national meetings presented by the aforementioned. The following documents have assisted plan development:

- *Frequently Asked Questions regarding the SPP/APR; Early Childhood Outcomes (Part C Indicator #3 and Part B Indicator #7) Published Oct. 4, 2005, this document answers common questions related to SPP/APR.* <http://www.fpg.unc.edu/~eco/pages/whatsnew.cfm#faqs>
- *Timelines for Reporting Child Outcome Data to OSEP; Published Sept. 21, 2005, this document covers the timelines for reporting child outcome data to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP).* <http://www.fpg.unc.edu/~eco/pages/whatsnew.cfm#faqs>
- *NEW: Part B Questions and Answers (FAQ) [Part B State Performance Plan \(SPP\) Questions and Answers](#) (updated 11/16); [Part B SPP Review Checklist](#) (updated 11/17) <http://www.federalresourcecenter.org/frc/sppb.htm>; Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) Questions and Answers, Revised 11-16-05 at 7:00 p.m. EST.*

During the pilot year, 2005-2006, data will be collected from a population of children who have entered Part B/619 services between the time period of April 2006 through September 2006, representing school districts in all five DHFS regions plus the city of Milwaukee. Selection of approximately two districts from

each region (Northern, Northeastern, Southern, Southeastern, and Western) and two schools within Milwaukee will provide representation from the state. In subsequent years, all entering and exiting students between the age of 3 through 5 years in selected districts will be included in the measurement. The process for selecting districts will be similar to sampling, but a less structured format, as is allowed in the phase-in process described by OSEP, the ECO Center, and conversations with Robin Rooney of NECTAC/ECO. A new cohort of districts will be added each year and include those districts that have reported in previous years. By the year 2011, all districts will be included in the data collection for this indicator.

During the pilot year, LEAs will be allowed to select assessment/measurement tools from a list of tools recommended by the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Center and the Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards resource listing. Information from the pilot year will be utilized to create a State of Wisconsin recommended list of three tools from which LEAs in subsequent years must select at least one tool. Professional judgment and parent report may also be utilized. Assessments will be conducted by either teams or individuals directly serving the child. From these multiple sources of information, individuals or teams will complete the ECO Center Child Outcome Summary Rating Scale to report to WDPI. The first measurement will occur no later than 45 days after the child initially receives early childhood special education services. The second measurement will occur in March for those children who are exiting early childhood special education services. The recommended list of tools will be developed in conjunction with the DHFS/Birth to 3 program by September 2006.

In the final form of the data collection system, LEAs will report the data to WDPI electronically. In building this system, initial steps will include the following parameters:

- LEAs will be required to maintain individual student data.
- FFY 2005-06 pilot year: LEAs report the number of children in each outcome area (a) who are functioning at a level comparable to same-age peers, and (b) who are functioning at a level below same-aged peers.
- FFY 2006-07 baseline data reported. Pilot districts will report progress data including the number of children in each outcome area (a) who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-age peers, (b) who improve functioning (not included in a), and (c) who did not improve functioning.
- The phase-in plan includes a system of involving an additional cohort, year by year.

FFY 2005: Pilot with approximately 12 districts (including Milwaukee) to establish procedures and status data on entry.

FFY 2006: Phase-in process to include approximately 85 districts and the original pilot districts.

FFY 2007: Add approximately 85 districts, the FFY 2006 districts and the original pilot districts.

FFY 2008: Add approximately 85 districts, the FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 districts, and the original pilot districts.

FFY 2009: Add approximately 85 districts, the FFY 2006, FFY 2007, and FFY 2008 districts, and the original pilot districts.

FFY 2010: Add approximately 85 districts, the FFY 2006, FFY 2007, FFY 2008, and FFY 2009 districts, and the original pilot districts equaling statewide implementation.

If the data collection system using individual student records is not developed by September 2006, the WDPI will require districts to report data in their special education plans.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Wisconsin
State

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process: N/A**Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):** N/A**Discussion of Baseline Data:** N/A**Measurable and Rigorous Target:** N/A

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	N/A
2006 (2006-2007)	N/A
2007 (2007-2008)	N/A
2008 (2008-2009)	N/A
2009 (2009-2010)	N/A
2010 (2010-2011)	N/A

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources: N/A

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to the overview section, pages 1-5.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

Percent = # of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities divided by the total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities times 100.

Describe how data are to be collected so that the State will be able to report baseline data and targets in the FFY 2005 APR due 2/1/07. *Sampling of parents to receive the survey is allowed. When sampling will be used, a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates must be submitted to OSEP.*

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) must collect data for this new indicator. WDPI is working with the National Center on Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) and the North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC), national and regional technical assistance centers established by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), to develop a method for data collection in Wisconsin. WDPI will utilize a parent survey created by NCSEAM.

Description of Methodology
Sample and Stratification Types

WDPI will implement a sampling design to collect information on this indicator from parent and primary caregivers throughout the state. The annual sample for this indicator consists of parents and primary caregivers of children with disabilities reported to WDPI on the December 1 child count. The sampling plan will incorporate five unique aspects of all types of educational entities. Children and youth with disabilities receive Part B special education services through education entities in Wisconsin that can be operationally defined by five specific categories. These include:

Category 1—LEAs in which all schools are charter schools

Category 2—LEAs with one or more charter schools

Category 3—LEAs containing no charter schools

Category 4—Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS)

Category 5—State schools, Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS), and Department of Corrections (DOC)

Table 1 below shows the general configuration of these categories, along with information about the number of entities in each category ("N"), percent of entities in the state (Percent of N), and percent of children and youth aged 3-21 in the state served within each categorical area (Percent Served in Part B). Wisconsin has 12 cooperative educational service agencies (CESAs) distributed geographically throughout the state that serve as regional resource providers to their member districts in such areas as special education, instructional services, and instructional technology. CESAs will assist with the data collection process.

Table 1: Wisconsin Educational Entities

LEA Category	Entity Status	N	Percent of N	Percent Served in Part B
1	LEAs are Charter Schools	11	2.49%	Less than 1%
2	LEAs have some Charter Schools	72	16.52%	33%
3	LEAs do not have Charter Schools	354	81.00%	53%
4	Milwaukee Public Schools	1	>1	13%
5	State Schools, DHFS, and DOC	4	>1	Less than 1%
Totals		442	100%	100%

Table 1 describes the various educational entities in which data will be collected from members of the “sampling frame,” that is, eligible parents and primary caregivers whose children and youth with disabilities received special education services based on December 1, 2004, child count. To ensure that all eligible parents and primary caregivers can be included in the sample, WDPI will employ a data collection strategy that will involve a sampling process proportionally drawn to be representative of three major stratification types:

1. **Stratification Based on LEA Enrollment.** Selection based on LEAs in Category 2 and Category 3. The total number of LEAs that compose this stratification level is 426 which includes about 96% of the LEAs in the state and accounts for 86% of Part B children and youth served in special education programs statewide.
2. **Stratification Based on MPS.** Selection based on LEAs in Category 4. States are required to annually sample from all LEAs with an Average Daily Membership that exceeds 50,000 children. In Wisconsin, this stratification level includes one LEA (MPS) and accounts for 13% of children and youth served in special education programs statewide.
3. **Stratification Based on Educational Entity Category.** Selection based on educational entities in Category 1 and Category 5. This stratification level includes 15 LEAs and accounts for approximately 1% of children and youth served in special education programs statewide.

The purpose for clustering the LEA categories into the three strata is: (1) to ensure that parents whose children and youth with disabilities were receiving services in all types of education entities could be included in the sample, (2) to ensure that the widest range of educational entities could be included in the sampling pool, particularly those that serve low-incidence disabilities and (3) to facilitate the overall logistics involved with data collection. Because one data collection strategy cannot be employed to serve all of these purposes simultaneously, the following section will describe the sample selection and data collection strategy for each level of stratification.

Sample Selection and Data Collection Strategy

1. Stratification Based on LEA Enrollment

Stratification based on LEA enrollment will involve a process in which LEAs in Categories 2 and 3 are combined and sampled according to student enrollment of all general and special education students. LEAs in these two categories are classified (below) according to enrollment groups identified previously by stakeholders (see indicator #1). The column entitled “Number of LEAs in Level” reflects the total

number of LEAs in each enrollment group or level. The column entitled “Number Sampled Per Year” reflects approximately one-sixth of the number of LEAs in each enrollment level that will be selected annually over a six-year period. For example, of the 228 LEAs in Level F, 38 entities will be randomly selected each year without replacement. All LEAs will be included in the sample within the six-year period, but once an LEA has been selected for sampling in any given year, it will not be “eligible” for selection again. Table 2 will be amended accordingly in ensuing years.

Table 2: Enrollment Levels of Category 2 and 3 LEAs

Enrollment Level	Total Student Enrollment	Number of LEAs in Level	Number Sampled Per Year
A	10,000 - 25,000	10	2
B	5,001 - 10,000	16	3
C	3,001 - 5,000	35	6
D	2,001 - 3,000	31	5
E	1,001 - 2,000	105	18
F	0 - 1,000	228	38
Totals		425	72

Selecting the sample for this stratification level will involve a two-stage process. The first stage involves selecting LEAs by a “roster” method of sampling. Using this procedure, LEAs in Table 2 will be listed in rank order for each enrollment level (i.e., A-F). The selection process begins at the point that separates 50% of the LEAs, rounding up for fractional numbers.

Once the starting point is determined, every “Nth” LEA will be selected—based on the number to be sampled annually over the six-year period. For example, to select LEAs from enrollment level F, the 114th LEA on the list would constitute the starting point (50% of 228) and every 6th LEA thereafter would be selected until the criterion of 38 LEAs was reached. This process will be repeated for each level A-F until the total of 72 LEAs has been selected (one-sixth of the LEAs in the state). 86% of the sample will be drawn from this stratification level since 86% of children with disabilities in the state receive special education from LEAs in Categories 2 and 3.

Following selection of all 72 LEAs for the first year of data collection, a second stage will ensue to select eligible parents of children and youth with disabilities. WDPI will ensure a sample is randomly selected that is representative of all parents of children and youth with disabilities by race/ethnicity and disability categories.

2. Stratification Based on MPS

To ensure that parents and primary caregivers of children and youth with disabilities living in large metropolitan areas are adequately represented in the sample and to adhere to OSEP requirement, the Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS) will be sampled every year. The district serves about 13% of the total number of children and youth with disabilities served in the state. Therefore, 13% of the sample of parents to complete the survey will be drawn from this stratification level.

The selection process to select schools within MPS will be similar to that described above. A roster method will be used to select approximately one-sixth, or about 39 schools per year without replacement. WDPI will randomly select a starting point and then select every “Nth” school until the criterion of 39 schools has been reached. Counting will proceed as if the list were “continuous,” that is, the count will resume at the top of the list when the bottom has been reached until all 39 schools have been selected.

3. Stratification Based on Educational Entity Type

Stratification by educational entity type includes LEAs in which all schools are charter schools; the state schools, including the Wisconsin School for the Visually Handicapped (WSVH) and the Wisconsin School for the Deaf (WSD); the Department of Corrections (DOC); and the Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS). While these entities serve only about 1% of the of the children and youth with disabilities receiving special education services in Wisconsin, they represent low incidence disabilities as well as incarcerated youth with disabilities.

Sample Size

The sample will consist of parents and primary caregivers of 383 children receiving special education services during a given school year. A sample size of 383 students was determined by using a sampling calculator made available on the web (<http://www.surveysystem.com/sscalc.htm#ssneeded>) by Creative Research Systems. The number of parents that will be selected for this sample reflects a confidence level of 95%, with a confidence interval of + or – 5%. Using the three stratification types described in the previous section, the parents and primary caregivers of 383 students will be selected annually and proportionally distributed within each stratum. Table 3 shows the general distribution of the sample that will be surveyed the first year of the SPP. As indicated previously, the sample of schools and districts will be selected without replacement, but the sample size should not vary significantly.

Table 3: Sample Size Based on Stratification Type

Stratification Type	Percent of Children and Youth with Disabilities Served	Sample Size Based on Percent Served
1. Stratification Based on LEA Enrollment	86%	.86 X 383 = 329
2. Stratification Based on MPSD Schools	13%	.13 X 383 = 50
3. Stratification Based on Educational Entity Type	1%	.01 X 383 = 4
Totals	100%	383

Instrumentation

WDPI will use the Part B Parent Survey developed by the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM). If a 619 survey is developed by NCSEAM in time to allow the survey process to be completed, it will also follow the general sampling design described.

Data Collection Procedures

Data collection procedures will largely involve the utilization of an internet parent survey, along with a range of other options to ensure widest coverage and return rate possible. Internet and non-internet options are described below:

1. Internet Survey. The WDPI will work with the NCRRC to provide the NCSEAM Parent Survey online. The WDPI will ensure an adequate response rate to the survey, including responses from under-represented populations and families of color, by working with local school districts, Wisconsin's two Parent Training and Information Centers (Wisconsin Family Assistance Center for Education, Training, and Support (FACETS) and Great Lakes Inter-Tribal Council Parent Education Project), the Community Parent Resource Center in Milwaukee Public Schools, and Wisconsin Statewide Parent-Educator Initiative (WSPEI) Parent Liaisons.

2. Non-Internet Options. In the event the parent or primary caregiver indicates they do not have access to the internet, or would prefer not to participate using the internet, the following options will be offered: (1) mail the parent survey to the parent or primary caregiver, or (2) administer and record survey responses over the phone. Multiple contacts will be made to ensure a high response rate.

Data Analysis Procedures

Both internet and non-internet methods of data collection will be processed in the manner in which the raw data are obtained. In the case of the internet, where the majority of completed surveys will be obtained, responses will be processed through a web-based database. In the case of mailed or parent surveys completed "face-to-face," responses will be scanned for entry into a database. In the case of phone surveys, the survey administrator will enter data into the web-based survey form. This data will be processed essentially the same as data collected through having parents or primary caregivers complete the survey over the internet.

Once all possible surveys have been collected, the data will be prepared for data analysis. Data analysis will largely involve descriptive statistics along with cross-tabulations in order to make multiple comparisons. Non-parametric statistics, such as the Chi-square will be used to identify significant differences in aggregated responses where necessary. Missing data will be treated either through a process of weighting or extrapolating the data to provide at least predicative information about the variable in question. Because the web-based survey will be designed to "require" a response before submitting the data, it is anticipated that very few, if any, will have any missing data. There is a similar expectation for surveys that have been administered over the phone. Only mailed surveys may have any missing data. As indicated, missing data will be treated through automatic controls within the statistical program or, if necessary, by weighting or extrapolation.

A report will be prepared by the NCRRC summarizing the results using a descriptive narrative accompanied with charts and graphs. To maintain confidentiality, no data will be reported in which it is possible to identify any particular child, school or district. The NCRRC will submit the report to the WDPI for inclusion in future annual performance reports (APRs).

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process: N/A

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005): N/A

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	N.A.
2006 (2006-2007)	N.A.
2007 (2007-2008)	N.A.
2008 (2008-2009)	N.A.
2009 (2009-2010)	N.A.
2010 (2010-2011)	N.A.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources: N.A.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

Refer to the overview section, pages 1-5.

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Measurement:

Percent = # of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification divided by # of districts in the State times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."

Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under 618(d), etc.

Describe how data are to be collected so that the State will be able to report baseline data and targets in the FFY 2005 APR due 2/1/07.

This is a new indicator and a description is required of how data will be collected so that the state will be able to report baseline data and targets in the FFY 2005 APR due February 1, 2007. Wisconsin annually collects district-level data, disaggregated by race/ethnicity, for students aged 3 through 21 in special education and in all disability categories. Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) uses *Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (December 1 Child Count)* to collect this data. The December 1, 2005, report will serve as the baseline for the FFY 2005 APR. WDPI has developed criteria for "disproportionate representation" and will apply the criteria to this disaggregated data. WDPI is working with Daniel Losen, nationally recognized expert and editor of the book, *Racial Inequality in Special Education*, and the National Center for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems (NCCRESt) to design a process for reviewing policies, practices, and procedures for determining whether the disproportionate representation is based on inappropriate identification.

Since the March submission of the APR, WDPI collected and analyzed the district level data and drafted criterion to identify "disproportionate representation" for use in the analysis of district data. In addition, WDPI was selected as one of nine states to partner with NCCRESt to receive technical assistance and build capacity to address racial disproportionality in special education at both the state and district level. As part of these efforts WDPI was able to provide a "2005 Summer Institute: Addressing Disproportionality." The first day of the summer institute was for a general audience and included presentations on national and local efforts, initiatives, and issues involved in understanding, identifying, and addressing racial disproportionality. The second day of the institute was for a targeted audience that included district level teams from nine of the larger districts and representatives from each of the 12 cooperative educational service agencies (CESAs). Additional information and presentations were given, followed by technical assistance in the form of disproportionality data review and analysis assistance and grant proposal development assistance. WDPI also provided mini-grant opportunities to those LEAs and CESAs attending the institute to assist them in addressing local concerns of disproportionality.

Criteria for Identifying Districts where there is disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification: This measure is based on a set of factors, all of which the district has exceeded for three consecutive years.

1. Risk Ratio of 2.0 or Greater In calculating the risk ratio, WDPI will use the Westat developed equation for risk ratio (risk for racial/ethnic group for disability category / risk for comparison group for disability category) with a comparison group of the remaining race/ethnic categories.

2. Minimum 1% Racial Disparity in Risk: Because white students have been the unit of comparison used by the National Research Council in their analysis of this issue, and because white students in Wisconsin have never been regarded as an overrepresented racial group in special education, or in any disability category, their risk level for the state is used as the comparison group for this second factor.

For each racial group, disproportionality may be considered where the risk level for the given group exceeds the state's risk level of white students in that category by at least one percent. This additional measure also ensures that districts will not be considered for the highest level of review where the risk for a given group is low. To ensure that white students could be regarded as overrepresented at the district level, white student risk level at the district level will be compared to white student risk level at the state level in the same manner as every other racial or ethnic group.

3. Cell size: To be identified for disproportionality based on statistical data, a racial or ethnic group must have at least ten members in a given cell used for risk ratio analysis, and a total enrollment of 100 students for any given racial group. Districts with smaller cell sizes will be considered under other criteria.

4. Other: Other criteria may be applied depending on unique circumstances including such considerations as state or federal discrimination complaints, IDEA complaints, and district demographics.

Consecutive Years: Because of changing demographics, anomalies in data collection, and other factors, WDPI requires districts to meet the above criteria for three consecutive years. In 2006, WDPI will begin to identify districts with disproportionate representation. The identification will be based on three consecutive years of data and analysis of district policies, procedures and practices. This will also enable WDPI to work with districts that are expected to be identified in a proactive manner, to provide districts with an opportunity to clarify any issues regarding accuracy of data, and to take steps to address concerns.

WDPI has begun to implement a number of steps, including providing grants to the CESAs and districts that attended the summer institute to help them identify and address disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification. There are several additional steps planned that are in progress.

Using the criteria described above, the WDPI has identified districts that have met or exceeded the criteria in at least one area for multiple years. WDPI will begin to provide technical assistance to these districts in 2006. In January 2006, these districts will be provided notice that preliminary data indicate disproportionality. Final determinations will be made and publicly reported. In determining whether the disproportionality is a result of inappropriate identification, Wisconsin will use a tiered-approach that will involve technical assistance, a self-assessment component, and an oversight process. Wisconsin anticipates using such tools as the rubric and checklist that are currently being developed by NCCRESt. If inappropriate identification is determined, WDPI will require corrective action, and will provide additional technical assistance. WDPI will continue to partner with NCCRESt and Daniel Losen to build capacity in this area, and to ensure that disproportionality identified as a result of inappropriate identification is effectively addressed.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process: N/A

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005): N/A

Discussion of Baseline Data: N/A

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	N/A
2006 (2006-2007)	N/A
2007 (2007-2008)	N/A
2008 (2008-2009)	N/A
2009 (2009-2010)	N/A
2010 (2010-2011)	N/A

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources: N/A

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to the overview section, pages 1-5.

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Measurement:

Percent = # of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification divided by # of districts in the State times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."

Describe how the State determined that disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures under 618(d), etc.

Describe how data are to be collected so that the State will be able to report baseline data and targets in the FFY 2005 APR due 2/1/07.

This is a new indicator and a description is required of how data will be collected so that the state will be able to report baseline data and targets in the FFY 2005 APR due February 1, 2007. Wisconsin collects annually district-level data, disaggregated by race/ethnicity, on special education students aged 3 through 21 in special education and in all disability categories. The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) uses the Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (December 1 Child Count) to collect this data. The December 1, 2005, report will serve as the baseline for the FFY 2005 APR. WDPI has developed criteria for disproportionate representation and will apply the criteria to this data. WDPI will apply the criteria disaggregated by each of the six specific disability categories (mental retardation, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism). WDPI is working with Daniel Losen, nationally recognized expert and editor of the book, *Racial Inequality in Special Education*, and the National Center for Culturally responsive Educational Systems (NCCRESt) to design a process for reviewing policies, practices, and procedures for determining whether the disproportionate representation is based on inappropriate identification.

Since the March submission of the APR, WDPI collected and analyzed the district level data and drafted criterion to identify "disproportionate representation" for use in the analysis of district data. In addition, WDPI was selected as one of nine states to partner with NCCRESt to receive technical assistance and build capacity to address racial disproportionality in special education at both the state and district level. As part of these efforts WDPI was able to provide a "2005 Summer Institute: Addressing Disproportionality." The first day of the summer institute was for a general audience and included presentations on national and local efforts, initiatives, and issues involved in understanding, identifying, and addressing racial disproportionality. The second day of the institute was for a targeted audience that included district level teams from nine of larger districts and representatives from each of 12 cooperative educational service agencies (CESAs). Additional information and presentations were given, followed by technical assistance in the form of disproportionality data review and analysis assistance and grant proposal development assistance. WDPI also provided mini-grant opportunities to those LEAs and CESAs attending the institute to assist them in addressing local concerns of disproportionality.

Criteria for Identifying Districts where there is disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification: This measure is based on a set of factors, all of which the district has exceeded for three consecutive years.

1. Risk Ratio of 2.0 or Greater In calculating the risk ratio, WDPI will use the Westat developed equation for risk ratio (risk for racial/ethnic group for disability category / risk for comparison group for disability category) with a comparison group of the remaining race/ethnic categories.

2. Minimum 1% Racial Disparity in Risk: Because white students have been the unit of comparison used by the National Research Council in their analysis of this issue, and because white students in Wisconsin have never been regarded as an overrepresented racial group in special education or in any disability category, their risk level for the state is used as the comparison group for this second indicator.

For each racial group, disproportionality is considered where the risk level for the given group exceeds the state's risk level of white students in that category by at least one percent. This additional measure also ensures that districts will not be considered for the highest level of review where the risk for a given group is low. To ensure that white students could be regarded as overrepresented at the district level, white student risk level at the district level will be compared to white student risk level at the state level in the same manner as every other racial or ethnic group.

3. Cell size: To be identified for disproportionality based on statistical data, a racial or ethnic group must have at least ten members in a given cell used for risk ratio analysis, and a total enrollment of 100 students for any given racial group. Districts with smaller cell sizes will be considered under other criteria.

4. Other: Other criteria may be applied depending on unique circumstances including such considerations as state or federal discrimination complaints, IDEA complaints, district demographics or resources.

Consecutive Years: Because of changing demographics, anomalies in data collection, and other factors, WDPI requires districts to meet the above criteria for three consecutive years. In 2006 WDPI will begin to identify districts with disproportionate representation. The identification will be based on three consecutive years of data and analysis of district policies, procedures, and practices. This will also enable WDPI to work with districts that are expected to be identified in a proactive manner, to provide districts with an opportunity to clarify any issues regarding accuracy of data, and to take steps to address concerns.

WDPI has begun to implement a number of steps, including providing grants to the CESAs and districts that attended the summer institute to help them identify and address disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification. There are several additional steps planned that are in progress.

Using the criteria described above, the WDPI has identified districts that have met or exceeded the criteria in at least one area for multiple years. WDPI will begin to provide technical assistance to these districts in 2006. In January 2006, these districts will be provided notice that preliminary data indicate disproportionality. Final determinations will be made and publicly reported. When determining whether the disproportionality is a result of inappropriate identification, WDPI will use a tiered-approach that will involve technical assistance, a self-assessment component, and an oversight process. WDPI anticipates using such tools as the rubric and checklist that are currently being developed by NCCRESt. If inappropriate identification is determined, WDPI will require corrective action, and will provide additional technical assistance. Wisconsin will continue to partner with NCCRESt and Daniel Losen to build capacity in this area, and to ensure that disproportionality identified as a result of inappropriate identification is effectively addressed.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process: N/A

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005): N/A

Discussion of Baseline Data: N/A

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	N/A
2006 (2006-2007)	N/A
2007 (2007-2008)	N/A
2008 (2008-2009)	N/A
2009 (2009-2010)	N/A
2010 (2010-2011)	N/A

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources: N/A

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to the overview section, pages 1-5.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Indicator 11: Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days (or State established timeline).

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- b. # determined not eligible whose evaluations and eligibility determinations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline).
- c. # determined eligible whose evaluations and eligibility determinations were completed within 60 days (or State established timeline).

Account for children included in a. but not included in b. or c. Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when eligibility was determined and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = b + c divided by a times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Since 1973, Wisconsin state law has required an evaluation for initial eligibility be completed and a placement notice to be sent to parents within 90 days of receipt of a referral for evaluation by the local educational agency (LEA). In interim guidance issued by the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) in May 2005, LEAs were advised to observe both the state-established timeline and the federal 60-day requirement. WDPI has requested OSEP to clarify in the final regulations implementing the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 2004 whether a state may establish a longer time period than 60 days. (Letter to Troy R. Justesen, August 31, 2005)

The State will use its procedural compliance monitoring system to collect data on indicator #11 beginning in the fall of 2006 for the 2005-2006 school year. Each year beginning in 2006-2007, one-sixth of all LEAs will complete a self-assessment of procedural requirements using a sample of student individualized education program (IEP) records. The Milwaukee Public Schools will be involved each year. All LEAs will complete a self-assessment of procedural requirements during the six-year State Performance Plan (SPP) cycle. The self-assessment will include reporting to WDPI the data in a., b., and c. above. LEAs will account for children included in a., but not included in b. or c.

For each case where the timeline is exceeded, the LEA will report the range of days beyond the timeline when eligibility was determined and any reasons for the delays. If there is a pattern of significantly overdue evaluations in an LEA, WDPI will verify LEA self-assessments and ensure the pattern of delays is corrected within one year of identification.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005): N/A

Discussion of Baseline Data: N/A

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010Wisconsin
State

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	N/A
2006 (2006-2007)	N/A
2007 (2007-2008)	N/A
2008 (2008-2009)	N/A
2009 (2009-2010)	N/A
2010 (2010-2011)	N/A

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources: N/A

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to the overview section, pages 1-5.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

Account for children included in a but not included in b or c. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and reasons for the delays.

Percent = c divided by a – b times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Wisconsin Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS) serves as the Part C lead agency and collects Birth to 3 data. While there are long-standing collaboration and communication efforts between the departments, there is currently no coordinated data collection system between DHFS and the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI). WDPI is now working with DHFS to develop a coordinated data collection system. To that end, WDPI, in partnership with DHFS, has applied for a General Supervision Enhancement Grant (GSEG) to build a comprehensive Birth-6 longitudinal data collection system.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005) (reporting period July 1, 2004, through June 30, 2005):

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination: 2717
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays: 375
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays: 1847 children were found eligible by their third birthday. This data set does not allow WDPI to determine if the IEP was developed and implemented by their third birthdays or if a parent refused services.

Data Source: DHFS

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Baseline data reported above was collected by DHFS and reported to WDPI. In an effort to determine the number of children found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays, DHFS conducted a review of exit codes for children turning 3 as reported by county agencies during 2004. DHFS determined the state average of children reported under "Code 24 – turned 3, special education eligibility not determined," and identified 18 counties that used this code at a percentage higher than the state average. Code 24 may be used for a child who was referred for an evaluation to determine special education eligibility, but eligibility was not determined by an IEP team by the time the child exited the Birth to 3 system. The 18 counties were contacted by DHFS and asked to identify the reasons that

children in their county were reported under Code 24. They were asked to consider: 1) Did the county program make the referral to the school at least 90 days prior to the child's third birthday? 2) Did the child have a summer birthday? 3) Was the child ultimately found eligible for special education services? 4) Does this closing reason more typically apply to children who reside in certain districts?

DHFS determined three primary reasons why Code 24 was used: 1) 60% of the counties used the code incorrectly to report children who were not referred either because parents refused or the Birth to 3 team felt a referral was not appropriate. The codes have since been revised to capture this information. 2) The child was referred later than the 90-day timeline because parents had not made a decision or the child came in contact with the Birth to 3 program after age 33 months. 3) Schools did not complete the IEP process in time, usually because of the summer break. This occurred primarily in districts that have little experience with Birth to 3 transitions. WDPI will work collaboratively with DHFS to provide training and technical assistance to ensure that children found eligible have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays (see improvement activities below).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100%
2006 (2006-2007)	100%
2007 (2007-2008)	100%
2008 (2008-2009)	100%
2009 (2009-2010)	100%
2010 (2010-2011)	100%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

WDPI will work collaboratively with DHFS to provide training on accurate reporting of exit codes. WDPI will notify LEAs in the 18 counties described earlier and will provide training on the requirement to ensure all children found eligible have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

Since Wisconsin does not currently have a coordinated data collection system between Birth to 3 and Part B, LEAs will provide the necessary data in their Special Education Plans due July 1, 2006. This will allow WDPI to collect a complete data set for July 1, 2004, through June 30, 2005. Using the reporting period July 1, 2004, through June 30, 2005, LEAs will report the following data:

- # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination.
- # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthdays.

- c. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibilities were determined after their third birthdays.
- d. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- e. # of children included in a, but not included in b or c or d (# of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented after their third birthday). Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and reasons for the delays.

WDPI will work to incorporate the needed data elements into an individual student record data collection system for the 2006-07 school year (SY). To that end, the WDPI has submitted a General Supervision Enhancement Grant (GSEG) in partnership with DHFS to build a comprehensive birth-6 longitudinal data system. The GSEG will allow WDPI to accomplish the following goals:

1. Create a data system with a single identifier number to better inform state and local providers and schools.
2. Develop an accountability measurement method that enables local providers to reliably, efficiently, and consistently collect and report child, family, and program outcome data, as well as information related to the transition from Part C to Part B services.
3. Develop a technology solution that bridges existing data systems, provides a mechanism to collect and disaggregate child and family outcome data, is responsive to local providers and families, and maintains high levels of confidentiality.
4. Build the state and local infrastructure that includes policies and professional development to ensure that data-based decisions result in program improvements.

Also see Ready, Set, Go Initiative under improvement activities in indicator #6.

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to the overview section, pages 1-5.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 13: Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

Percent = # of youth with disabilities aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals divided by # of youth with an IEP age 16 and above times 100.

Describe how data are to be collected so that the State will be able to report baseline data and targets in the FFY 2005 APR due 2/1/07.

This is a new indicator for which the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) must collect data. During the 2005-2006 school year, WDPI redesigned its procedural compliance monitoring system to ensure all noncompliance is corrected as soon as possible, but no later than one year after identification. Beginning in the 2006-2007 school year, the department will implement a re-designed system focusing on those requirements related to the state performance plan (SPP) indicators and other issues of statewide significance. An LEA self-assessment of procedural requirements will include a review of the number of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals. WDPI will ensure all LEAs have adopted policies and procedures that comply with IDEA 2004 and state law and will review special education forms in use in LEAs to ensure compliance.

See discussion of compliance monitoring system under indicator #15 for more information.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process: N/A

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005): N/A

Discussion of Baseline Data: N/A

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	N/A
2006 (2006-2007)	N/A

2007 (2007-2008)	N/A
2008 (2008-2009)	N/A
2009 (2009-2010)	N/A
2010 (2010-2011)	N/A

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**Wisconsin Statewide Transition Initiative (WSTI)** (www.wsti.org)

The Wisconsin Statewide Transition Initiative (WSTI) is a WDPI statewide systems change project that offers a comprehensive approach to providing transition services in the State of Wisconsin. Twelve cooperative educational service agency (CESA)-based transition coordinators, a project director, and a WDPI transition consultant provide transition support services, information dissemination, and staff development to parents, education professionals, and community agency professionals throughout Wisconsin. WSTI is in its sixth year of implementation. Currently each of the twelve CESAs receives mini-grants to provide transition services. WSTI also hosts a statewide transition conference each year. WSTI utilizes a two-tiered service delivery model consisting of local school district Transition Action Teams and County Transition Advisory Councils. Point of Entry Manuals are developed for each CESA to identify county agency linkages. Additional school districts and counties are now part of WSTI as a result of funding from the State Improvement Grant (SIG).

WDPI has worked collaboratively with Dr. Ed O'Leary of the Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center to develop technical assistance on the correct implementation of transition requirements in IDEA. Districts that participate in WSTI receive training in how to review these requirements in individualized education programs (IEPs) using a transition checklist. The checklist includes a review of the percent of youth with disabilities aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals. An online training program is available for statewide training. Dr. Ed O'Leary and OSEP have recognized Wisconsin's work in the area of transition as a national model.

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to the overview section, pages 1-5.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 14: Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

Percent = # of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school divided by # of youth assessed who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school times 100.

Describe how data are to be collected so that the State will be able to report baseline data and targets in the FFY 2005 APR due 2/1/07. *Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, include a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.*

This is a new indicator for which the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) must collect data. The U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), is now requiring states to report the percent of youth who had individualized education programs (IEPs), are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school. In order to collect this information, states may use a sample, but every local educational agency (LEA) in the state must be included in the sample within the six-year period of the State Performance Plan (SPP). Furthermore, any district with an average daily membership of more than 50,000 students must be included in the sample each year.

Since 2000, the WDPI in collaboration with Cooperative Educational Service Agency (CESA) #11 and St. Norbert College Survey Center has conducted a statewide post high school outcomes survey of youth with disabilities who have successfully exited high school (<http://dpi.wi.gov/sped/posthigh.html>). The survey has included a statewide representative sample of youth with disabilities and measured whether youth are employed, attending postsecondary school, and/or living independently one, three, and five years after exiting high school.

Although Wisconsin's post high school study has previously been recognized by OSEP as a model for other states, the survey results do not provide information at the local level and, therefore, LEAs are not able to make programming decisions based on the statewide results. Furthermore, the study has not included every LEA in the survey process. WDPI will continue to work collaboratively with CESA #11 and St. Norbert College Survey Center to conduct the post high school outcomes survey; however, the method for determining the survey sample will be revised to address the new reporting requirements and to provide more meaningful information for LEAs.

In preparation for developing a revised data collection plan for the SPP, WDPI has participated in teleconferences with the National Center on Secondary Education and Transition (NCSET) and OSEP, and the Post-School Outcomes Community of Practice sponsored by the National Post-School Outcomes Center (NPSO), as well as utilized materials and technical assistance from NPSO. Representatives from WDPI, the State Transition Summit work group, the Wisconsin Statewide Transition Initiative (WSTI) and

personnel from institutions of higher education met to determine a suitable sampling strategy and to determine sampling variables.

Procedures for Establishing a Representative Sample

For purposes of this survey, local educational agency (LEA) includes Wisconsin public school districts, the Wisconsin School for the Deaf (WSD), the Wisconsin School for the Visually Handicapped (WSVH), the Department of Corrections (DOC), and the Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS). "Leaver" means the student exited their high school education setting with a regular diploma, a modified diploma or certificate of attendance, left at maximum age of eligibility for special education and related services, or exited prior to graduation (dropped out). One district, Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS), has more than 50,000 students.

The LEAs will be entered into an Excel database through direct data transfer from the WDPI, and will include the sampling variables used to select the representative sample for the 2005-06 school year. Sampling will be completed without replacement, meaning each district will participate once during the six-year period of the SPP. The representative sample of districts and students will be established in March of 2006 and will include students with IEPs who are in their last year of high school. All students with IEPs in those selected districts who are "leavers" will be considered when creating the representative sample. Each LEA sample will be representative of all LEA "leavers" by race/ethnicity, disability categories, and exit status.

Each year, the sample will be representative of the state population of leavers with disabilities. Averages will be computed for incidence of gender, race/ethnicity, disability categories, and district size across one-sixth of the districts in the state (approximately 1,200 former students) and for the state as a whole. Comparisons between the selected averages and the state averages will be calculated to assure there are no statistical differences between the sample and the statewide averages on any of the demographic variables. If differences in the incidence of students with disabilities are present among districts, it will be possible to sample in a manner that accounts for those differences in the composition of the sample. This will ensure the distribution of students with IEPs form a representative sample when aggregated statewide. The goal in the sampling process is to maximize the similarity between the sample and the population while minimizing the differences and sampling error. If warranted, the analysis and correction of non-responders, poor response rate, and selection bias will be conducted. The amount of acceptable sampling error will be plus or minus 3% at the 95% confidence level.

The state will ensure that each of the LEAs participates at least once every six years and will annually include Milwaukee Public Schools. Results will be annually reported to the public to guide program improvement efforts that will positively affect the education achievement of students with IEPs. The data collection system is designed to ensure a strong response rate from former students and to provide valuable district data in addition to statewide data. The state will not report to the public any personally identifiable information about former students or data that is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information.

During the 2005-06 school year, contact information on the exiting students will be gathered by LEAs and reported to CESA #11. During the 2006-07 school year, leavers will be contacted by telephone between April and June for an interview. The interviews will be conducted by St. Norbert College Survey Center to ensure inter-rater reliability.

Responses will be entered by St. Norbert College Survey Center on a web-based survey site (www.posthighsurvey.org) that will allow for immediate data entry and retrieval. The interviews will assess former students' participation in independent living activities, post-secondary education, and employment one year after exiting high school. Additionally, student participation in high school job exploration, employment, and vocational preparation will be assessed. Data results will be disaggregated by gender, race/ethnicity, and disability category.

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010Wisconsin
State**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process: N/A****Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005): N/A****Discussion of Baseline Data: N/A**

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	N/A
2006 (2006-2007)	N/A
2007 (2007-2008)	N/A
2008 (2008-2009)	N/A
2009 (2009-2010)	N/A
2010 (2010-2011)	N/A

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources: N/A

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to the overview section, pages 1-5.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 15: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

A. Percent of noncompliance related to monitoring priority areas and indicators corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance made related to monitoring priority areas and indicators.
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent = b divided by a times 100.

For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and/or enforcement that the State has taken.

B. Percent of noncompliance related to areas not included in the above monitoring priority areas and indicators corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance made related to such areas.
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent = b divided by a times 100.

For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and/or enforcement that the State has taken.

C. Percent of noncompliance identified through other mechanisms (complaints, due process hearings, mediations, etc.) corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of agencies in which noncompliance was identified through other mechanisms.
- b. # of findings of noncompliance made.
- c. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent = c divided by b times 100.

For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and/or enforcement that the State has taken.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:
Elements of the General Supervision System

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) has worked in collaboration with the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) to develop a general supervision system based on the six critical elements of general supervision described below. The details of the various elements are discussed in a number of the other indicators.

1) Measurable priorities – Through a stakeholder process, WDPI has identified measurable priorities to address through its general supervision system. The priority areas include State Performance Plan (SPP)

indicators and priority areas to be addressed through continuous improvement and focused monitoring. The measurable priority areas identified by stakeholders are the gap in graduation rates between students with disabilities and students without disabilities and the gap in 8th grade reading achievement between students with disabilities and students without disabilities. In addition, WDPI has identified racial disproportionality as a priority area to be addressed through a statewide initiative.

2) Establishment of effective model policies and procedures – During the 2006-2007 school year, WDPI will ensure all local educational agencies (LEAs) have adopted policies and procedures that comply with IDEA 2004 and state law. Special education forms in use in LEAs will be reviewed to ensure compliance. Wisconsin's statewide initiative targeting racial disproportionality will also include a review of LEA policies, procedures, and practices that may be related to inappropriate identification.

3) Data collection and analysis of program progress and results – WDPI collects data related to SPP indicators and priority areas through the LEA Special Education Plan (SEP), LEA 618 data report, the Individual Student Enrollment System (ISES), and the annual School Performance Report (SPR). WDPI is implementing measures to ensure the accuracy of this data. Also WDPI reviews data from IDEA complaints, due process hearing decisions, and procedural compliance monitoring. The data collected through these systems has informed WDPI's establishment of priority areas, goals, and activities designed to achieve the goals and targets set out in the SPP.

4) Targeted training and technical assistance – Training and technical assistance will focus on priority areas established by stakeholders and SPP indicators. LEAs identified using the data systems described above will receive targeted training and technical assistance to improve results for children, correct noncompliance, and address inappropriate identification resulting in racial disproportionality. IDEA funds support this targeted training.

5) Effective, responsive complaint process - The State has established effective, responsive systems for IDEA complaints, due process hearings, and mediation. These are described in indicator #15 below and indicator #19. Issues raised in these systems are considered in designing self assessment of procedural requirements required of all LEAs.

6) Meaningful focused monitoring – WDPI's Continuous Improvement and Focused Monitoring System (CIFMS) will target LEAs identified for improvement in the priority areas of graduation gap and 8th grade reading gap using data collected from LEAs. LEAs identified for improvement will participate in a data retreat, drilling down in the data to develop hypotheses about poor outcomes for children. WDPI staff will conduct onsite reviews to assist LEAs in identifying issues related to outcomes for children. LEA staff and WDPI staff will review results of these activities and develop an improvement plan. WDPI staff will facilitate technical assistance for the LEA to meet the goals of its improvement plan. If noncompliance is identified during the CIFMS activities, the LEA will be required to correct the noncompliance as soon as possible, but no later than one year after identification (see indicators #1 and #3). Also WDPI will require each LEA in the state to conduct a self assessment of procedural requirements focused on SPP indicators and other issues of statewide significance. LEAs will develop a corrective action plan to timely correct noncompliance when it is identified. WDPI will verify LEA self assessments through desk audits and site visits. The LEA self assessment of procedural requirements is described below.

Compliance Monitoring

In its October 13, 2005, response to Wisconsin's March 2005 Annual Performance Report (APR), the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) directed WDPI to demonstrate that any noncompliance it identified through monitoring during the reporting period July 1, 2003, through June 30, 2004, was corrected within one year. WDPI completed its six-year monitoring cycle in 2003-2004 by monitoring 22 LEAs (21 school districts and the Wisconsin Department of Corrections). As a result of monitoring activities, all LEAs were required to develop corrective action plans (CAPs). Each LEA's SEP consultant visited the LEA to review compliance and to provide technical assistance to ensure correction of noncompliance. The LEA's SEP consultant made at least one additional contact with the LEA to verify correction of noncompliance. All LEAs were visited. All noncompliance identified through monitoring during the 2003-2004 school year has been corrected and all CAPs are now closed.

During the six-year monitoring cycle, from 1998-99 to 2003-04, WDPI focused on monitoring LEAs for compliance with procedural requirements. Monitoring activities included on-site reviews of pupil records and interviews with school staff, parents, and adult students. The WDPI's monitoring procedures during the six-year monitoring cycle required WDPI to verify correction of noncompliance no earlier than one year after the approval of the LEA's corrective action plan. If the initial corrective action plan was not successful in correcting noncompliance, the LEA was required to implement a second, and, if required, a third plan. These procedures did not ensure correction within one year of identification in all cases. In December 2004, WDPI received information from OSEP clarifying all noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible, but no later than one year after identification. Accordingly, WDPI modified its procedures. WDPI's current procedural monitoring system described below incorporates this requirement.

During the 2004-2005 school year, WDPI verified correction of noncompliance and closed CAPs in 121 LEAs, which included CAPs from previous school years. In addition to CAP verification activities, during the 2004-2005 school year WDPI provided technical assistance to LEAs to begin implementing the provisions of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004 (IDEA 2004) on July 1, 2005. The WDPI provided LEAs with written guidance on IDEA 2004 requirements (<http://dpi.wi.gov/sped/doc/idea04change.doc>), including the new requirements for equitable participation of parentally-placed private school students with disabilities (<http://dpi.wi.gov/sped/doc/prischpart.doc> and <http://dpi.wi.gov/sped/doc/idea04070105.doc>), significant changes in due process procedures (<http://dpi.wi.gov/sped/doc/idea04change-dueproc.doc>), and requirements for early intervening services (<http://dpi.wi.gov/sped/doc/grt-15percent.doc>). WDPI developed and disseminated supplemental forms and directions for implementing IDEA 2004 provisions (<http://dpi.wi.gov/sped/doc/form-mem0505.doc>). WDPI sponsored training on the re-authorized IDEA and updated its training of due process hearing officers.

During the 2005-2006 school year, WDPI is piloting its continuous improvement and focused monitoring system designed to improve results for children with disabilities in reading achievement and in graduation rates. One component of the system is a review of procedural requirements most closely related to these priority areas. When noncompliance is identified, the LEA is required to correct the noncompliance as soon as possible, but no later than one year after identification.

During the 2005-2006 school year, WDPI is redesigning its procedural compliance monitoring system to ensure all noncompliance is corrected as soon as possible, but no later than one year after identification. Beginning in the 2006-2007 school year, WDPI will implement a re-designed system focusing on those requirements related to the SPP indicators and other issues of statewide significance. WDPI will ensure all LEAs have adopted policies and procedures that comply with IDEA 2004 and state law. Special education forms in use in LEAs will be reviewed to ensure compliance.

Each year beginning in 2006-2007, one-sixth of LEAs in the state will conduct a self assessment of procedural requirements related to monitoring priority areas and SPP indicators using a sample of student individualized education program (IEP) records. The self assessment of procedural requirements will include data on the number of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet post-secondary goals. The data will be reported for SPP indicator #13. LEAs will be selected each year based on factors such as enrollment and location. Milwaukee Public Schools will be included each year. All LEAs will conduct a self assessment of procedural requirements during the current SPP time period. LEAs will report the self assessment results to WDPI, along with planned corrective actions. LEAs will be required to correct noncompliance as soon as possible, but no later than one year after identification.

Annually, WDPI will review all LEA self assessments and conduct verification activities on a portion of the LEA self assessments. Based on its review, WDPI will provide technical assistance to LEAs, which may result in revisions to their planned corrective actions. LEAs will report the status of their corrective actions to ensure correction within one year of identification of the noncompliance. WDPI will verify that all noncompliance has been corrected within one year. LEAs failing to correct noncompliance within one

year of identification will be required to report the reasons and the specific steps that will be implemented to correct the noncompliance. These LEAs will be assigned to a more intensive level of oversight.

State IDEA Complaints, Due Process Hearings, Mediations**Complaints**

WDPI is responsible for investigating complaints and issuing decisions within 60 calendar days of receipt of the complaint. WDPI staff review all relevant information and make an independent determination, based upon a preponderance of the evidence, about whether the district has met a requirement. WDPI's decision includes findings of fact and a conclusion for each issue. When the district already has taken child-specific or general action to correct noncompliance, the decision reflects the district's corrective measures. If the district must take additional corrective action, generally the decision includes a directive for the agency to submit to WDPI, within a specified time, generally within 30 days of the decision, a corrective action plan. The plan addresses each violation and specifies the time period, not to exceed one year from the date of the decision, within which compliance will be achieved. Complaint decisions occasionally specify the action to be taken and a time for correction. The directive addresses corrective actions appropriate to the specific child or children whose education is the subject of the complaint and corrective actions to insure appropriate future provision of services for all children with disabilities. If no corrective action is required, the letter includes a statement closing the complaint. The CAP or decision will include a date for submission of documentation that corrective activities have been completed. The complaint is closed when the public agency submits documentation it has complied with the directives in the complaint decision or the decision finds no violations of requirements.

Due Process

During the period July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004, seven due process hearings were fully adjudicated. Noncompliance was identified in one of those hearings. During this time period, WDPI did not require noncompliance identified through due process hearing decisions be corrected within one year of identification. At the time, and to this date, 34 CFR 300.661(c)(3) requires that a complaint alleging a public agency's failure to implement a due process decision must be resolved by the State Education Agency. WDPI understood its authority to address noncompliance in a due process hearing was limited to this requirement.

Currently there is a one-year state statute of limitations for due process hearing requests. A hearing is requested by sending a letter or a completed sample form to WDPI. The parent request includes the name and address of the child, the name of the school the child is attending, a description of the nature of the problem relating to the hearing request including the facts relating to such problem, and a proposed resolution of the problem to the extent known and available to the parents at the time. WDPI acknowledges receipt of a hearing request in a letter describing district responsibilities including the holding of a resolution session within 15 days of receiving the hearing request. When a hearing is requested, WDPI, by contract with the Wisconsin Department of Administration--Division of Hearings and Appeals (DHA), appoints an impartial hearing officer to conduct the hearing. Hearing officers are attorneys who receive an initial, and at least annual, training from WDPI regarding special education requirements. Except in cases requiring an expedited hearing, the hearing officer must issue a written decision based solely upon the evidence presented at the hearing within 45 days following completion of the 30-day resolution session period. The hearing officer may extend the 45-day timeline, for cause, if the parent or the school district requests an extension. The hearing decision notifies the parties that within 45 days after the administrative law judge's decision has been issued, either party may appeal the decision to the circuit court for the county in which the child resides or to federal district court.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):**Monitoring**

See Tables 15A and 15C attached.

Complaints

In 33 of 34 investigations with findings, noncompliance was corrected within one year. (See below.)

Due process

There was one fully-adjudicated decision with a finding of noncompliance. WDPI did not determine whether correction was completed within one year. WDPI has since confirmed with the district that corrective action required through the hearing decision has been completed.

Discussion of Baseline Data:**Compliance Monitoring**

Baseline data was obtained from on-site monitoring of 22 LEAs during the 2003-2004 school year and correction of noncompliance within one year of identification during the 2004-2005 school year. These activities occurred prior to OSEP's development of the SPP priority areas and indicators. Therefore, many requirements monitored during the period are not related to an SPP indicator. The compliance monitoring system is being redesigned to focus on assessing requirements related to the priority areas and indicators and other statewide issues. Based on OSEP's draft guidance on requirements related to indicators, WDPI performed an analysis of requirements monitored during the baseline period to determine if they were related to SPP indicators. Requirements were assigned to SPP indicators as appropriate. The baseline data will be revised after OSEP provides final guidance on requirements related to indicators.

As stated in the "Overview of Issues," WDPI's monitoring procedures during this time period did not require WDPI to verify correction of noncompliance within one year after the identification of the LEA's noncompliance. If the initial corrective action plan was not successful in correcting noncompliance, the LEA was required to implement a second or a third plan. The percentage of noncompliance corrected within one year reflects procedures during that time period. Although procedures did not require WDPI to verify that noncompliance was corrected within one year of identification, more than one-third of noncompliance related to monitoring priority areas was corrected within one year of identification. Similarly, the low percentage for requirements not related to indicators reflects WDPI's procedures in place at the time.

Complaints

During the baseline period, WDPI's complaint procedures did not require WDPI staff to verify the correction of noncompliance within a year of identification. During the period, 60 complaints were filed. The investigations of these complaints resulted in 34 decisions with findings that the districts' actions did not meet requirements for at least one issue. While WDPI's procedures did not require correction of noncompliance within one year of identification, WDPI verified correction of noncompliance for 33 decisions with findings within one year of identifying noncompliance. Often the investigations were closed within a matter of two to three months. In one investigation noncompliance was fully corrected six weeks beyond the one year deadline; however, child-specific corrective action was completed within several months following issuance of the decision.

Due process

Discussed above.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100% of LEAs correct noncompliance as soon as possible, but no later than one year after identification.
2006 (2006-2007)	100% of LEAs correct noncompliance as soon as possible, but no later than one year after identification.
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of LEAs correct noncompliance as soon as possible, but no later than one year after identification.
2008 (2008-2009)	100% of LEAs correct noncompliance as soon as possible, but no later than one year after identification.
2009 (2009-2010)	100% of LEAs correct noncompliance as soon as possible, but no later than one year after identification.
2010 (2010-2011)	100% of LEAs correct noncompliance as soon as possible, but no later than one year after identification.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**Compliance Monitoring**

WDPI's Procedural Compliance Workgroup, consisting of five professional staff, will work to redesign procedural compliance monitoring to focus on priority areas and SPP indicators. The new procedures will be designed to ensure that noncompliance is corrected as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year after identification. All LEAs will be monitored for procedural compliance during the SPP six-year period. WDPI will undertake the activities below to ensure it reaches 100% correction of noncompliance within one year.

WDPI will undertake the following activities in 2005-2006:

- Disseminate information on IDEA 2004 requirements.
- Prepare and distribute model LEA policies and procedures after final IDEA 2004 regulations are promulgated.
- Revise the procedural compliance monitoring system to focus on requirements related to priority areas and SPP indicators.
- Develop a reporting system for LEA compliance monitoring.
- Establish a six-year cycle of procedural compliance monitoring.
- Assist LEAs to comply with transition requirements through WSTI (Wisconsin Statewide Transition Initiative).

WDPI will undertake the following activities in 2006-2007:

- Verify that LEAs have adopted policies and procedures that comply with IDEA 2004 and state law.
- Verify that LEAs have adopted IEP team forms that comply with IDEA 2004 and state law.

- Train staff of LEAs schedule for 2006-2007 monitoring on self assessment of procedural requirements and reporting.
- Initiate a system for LEAs to report self assessment of procedural requirements results and planned corrective activities.
- Review LEA self assessments of procedural requirements.
- Verify a sample of LEA self assessment of procedural requirements and provide technical assistance as needed.
- Verify that LEAs conducting a self assessment of procedural requirements have corrected noncompliance within one year of identification.
- Assist LEAs to comply with transition requirements through WSTI.

WDPI will undertake the following activities in the remaining years of the SPP cycle:

- Provide training on self assessment and reporting to LEAs required to conduct a self assessment of procedural requirements.
- Initiate a web-based system for reporting self assessment of procedural requirements results and planned corrective activities.
- Review LEA self assessments.
- Verify a sample of LEA self assessment of procedural requirements and provide technical assistance as needed.
- Verify that LEAs conducting self assessment of procedural requirements have corrected noncompliance within one year of identification.
- Assist LEAs to comply with transition requirements through WSTI.

Complaints

WDPI has revised its complaint procedures to verify correction of noncompliance within one year of identification. An additional tracking mechanism will alert staff that an open complaint investigation is approaching the one-year anniversary of a finding of noncompliance.

Due Process Hearings

WDPI staff responsible for coordinating the due process hearing system will review all fully-adjudicated hearing decisions to determine whether noncompliance was identified. WDPI staff will contact the district after the relevant appeal period has passed to confirm that corrective action related to findings of noncompliance was completed within any ordered time frame and no later than one year after the finding of noncompliance. The dates when noncompliance was determined and when corrective measures were completed will be noted in WDPI's electronic log to enable reporting in each APR that correction was completed within one year.

Monitoring information for Part B Indicator #15 in the SPP.
See “Related Requirements” for statutory and regulatory requirements related to each Indicator.

Table for #15 A

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B		
Indicator	Measurement Calculation	Explanation
<p>15.</p> <p>A. Percent of noncompliance related to monitoring priority areas and indicators corrected within one year of identification:</p> <p>c. # of findings of noncompliance made related to monitoring priority areas and indicators.</p> <p>d. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>Percent = b divided by a times 100.</p>	<p>See attached Calculation Chart for specifications of data included here.</p> <p>a = 51</p> <p>b = 18</p> <p>$b/a = 18/51 = .35$ $\times 100 = 35\%$</p> <p>Note: As of December, 2005, 100% of the noncompliance findings have been corrected.</p>	

Compilation Table

Indicator	Monitoring Mechanism	# LEAs Reviewed	# LEAs with Findings	a. # of Findings	b. # of Findings Corrected w/in 1 yr	% Corrected w/in 1 yr
1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.	Self-Assessment	0	NA	NA	NA	NA
	On-site Visit	0	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Data Review	0	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Other: Specify	0	NA	NA	NA	NA
2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping of high school	Self-Assessment	0	NA	NA	NA	NA
	On-site Visit	0	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Data Review	0	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Other: Specify	0	NA	NA	NA	NA
3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments	Self-Assessment	0	NA	NA	NA	NA
	On-site Visit	22	16	19	3	16%
	Data Review	0	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Other: Specify	0	NA	NA	NA	NA
4. Rates of suspension and expulsion	Self-Assessment	0	NA	NA	NA	NA
	On-site Visit	22	1	1	0	0%
	Data Review	0	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Other: Specify	0	NA	NA	NA	NA
5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 – educational placements	Self-Assessment	0	NA	NA	NA	NA
	On-site Visit	22	12	31	15	48%
	Data Review	0	NA	NA	NA	NA

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Wisconsin
State

Indicator	Monitoring Mechanism	# LEAs Reviewed	# LEAs with Findings	a. # of Findings	b. # of Findings Corrected w/in 1 yr	% Corrected w/in 1 yr
	Other: Specify	0	NA	NA	NA	NA
6. Percent of preschool children who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers	Self-Assessment	0	NA	NA	NA	NA
	On-site Visit	0	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Data Review	0	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Other: Specify	0	NA	NA	NA	NA
7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrated improved outcomes NEW INDICATOR NO DATA 2004-05	Self-Assessment					
	On-site Visit					
	Data Review					
	Other: Specify					
8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parents involvement NEW INDICATOR NO DATA 2004-05	Self-Assessment					
	On-site Visit					
	Data Review					
	Other: Specify					
9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education NEW INDICATOR NO DATA 2004-05	Self-Assessment					
	On-site Visit					
	Data Review					
	Other: Specify					
10. Percent of children with parental consent to	Self-Assessment					

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Wisconsin
State

Indicator	Monitoring Mechanism	# LEAs Reviewed	# LEAs with Findings	a. # of Findings	b. # of Findings Corrected w/in 1 yr	% Corrected w/in 1 yr
evaluate, evaluated within State established timelines NEW INDICATOR NO DATA 2004-05	On-site Visit					
	Data Review					
	Other: Specify					
12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday	Self-Assessment	0	NA	NA	NA	NA
	On-site Visit	0	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Data Review	0	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Other: Specify	0	NA	NA	NA	NA
13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable student to meet the post-secondary goals NEW INDICATOR NO DATA 2004-05	Self-Assessment					
	On-site Visit					
	Data Review					
	Other: Specify					
14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school NEW INDICATOR NO DATA 2004-05	Self-Assessment					
	On-site Visit					
	Data Review					
	Other: Specify					

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Wisconsin
State

Indicator	Monitoring Mechanism	# LEAs Reviewed	# LEAs with Findings	a. # of Findings	b. # of Findings Corrected w/in 1 yr	% Corrected w/in 1 yr
TOTALS	SUM COLUMNS A AND B			51	18	

Table for #15B

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B		
Indicator	Measurement Calculation	Explanation
<p>15</p> <p>B. Percent of noncompliance related to areas not included in the above monitoring priority areas and indicators corrected within one year of identification:</p> <p>c. # of findings of noncompliance made related to such areas.</p> <p>d. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>Percent = b divided by a times 100.</p>	<p>a = 200</p> <p>b = 29</p> <p>$b/a = 29/200 = .15$</p> <p>$.15 \times 100 = 15\%$</p> <p>Note: As of December, 2005, 100% of the noncompliance findings have been corrected.</p>	<p>Areas of noncompliance citations:</p> <p>Evaluation</p> <p>IEP team composition</p> <p>IEP team meeting</p> <p>IEP content</p> <p>Notice</p> <p>Availability of Resources</p>

Table for Indicator #15C

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B		
Indicator	Measurement Calculation	Explanation
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>C. Percent of noncompliance identified through other mechanisms (complaints, due process hearings, mediations, etc.) corrected within one year of identification:</p> <p>d. # of agencies in which noncompliance was identified through other mechanisms.</p> <p>e. # of findings of noncompliance made.</p> <p>f. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>Percent = c divided by b times 100.</p> <p>Note: As of December, 2005, 100% of the noncompliance findings have been corrected.</p>	<p>a = 24</p> <p>b = 48</p> <p>c = 47</p> <p>47/48 = 98%</p> <p>98% of noncompliance identified through other mechanisms were corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>24 agencies had issues in the dispute resolution system where findings were made.</p> <p>There were 48 findings of noncompliance in the following areas –</p> <p>8 proper IEP 7 evaluation 4 records 3 transfer 3 suspension 23 properly implemented IEP</p> <p>47 of the findings were corrected within one year of identification</p> <p>The areas in which correction was not completed within one year were evaluation, suspension and IEP properly implemented (child-specific correction was completed within one year in all instances)</p> <p>Note: There were 4 additional findings made in due process. These are not included in the calculation because during the relevant time period there</p>

Part B State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

Wisconsin
State

		was no requirement for the department to ensure correction.
--	--	---

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to the overview section, pages 1-5.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 16: Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

Percent = $(1.1(b) + 1.1(c))$ divided by (1.1) times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) is responsible for investigating complaints and issuing a decision within 60 calendar days of receipt of the complaint. A complaint must be in writing and signed, it must allege a violation of subchapter V of Chapter 115, Stats., state rules, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and/or 34 CFR Part 300, and it must set out sufficient facts to permit WDPI to initiate an investigation of the allegation. Parents periodically decide to withdraw complaints, often in light of action taken by the district in response to the complaint; and in such cases WDPI closes the investigation. WDPI sets aside a complaint issue when a due process hearing has been requested on the same issue. A complaint alleging an agency's failure to implement a due process decision will be resolved through the complaint procedures. WDPI may extend the 60-day time limit for exceptional circumstances such as the unavailability of necessary parties or information. WDPI carries out an independent investigation, on site if necessary. Department staff review all relevant information and make an independent determination, based upon a preponderance of the evidence, about whether the district has violated a requirement. WDPI's decision includes findings of fact and a conclusion for each issue.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

See attachment 1.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

WDPI received 66 complaints during the period July 1, 2004, to June 30, 2005. Five complaints were withdrawn. One complaint was set aside because the issues were being addressed in due process, but has since been decided. Fifty-one complaints were resolved within 60 days of receipt. Ten complaints were not resolved within 60 days. During the reporting period, the percentage of complaint investigations completed within required time limits is 84%.

WDPI reported in the APR dated March 2005 that 60 of 61 complaint investigations received during the period July 1, 2003, to June 30, 2004, were completed within required time periods and that the one untimely decision was one day late. The percent of investigations not completed within time requirements for 2004-2005 is similar to what it had been for several years prior to the period covered in the March 2005 APR. Several factors may account for late decisions. In several cases materials requested from school districts by complaint investigators did not arrive in a timely manner. Several of the decisions which were issued late contain multiple and complex issues. The decisions in all but one of the late decisions were due after April 2005. Several of the staff who investigate complaints also were responsible for developing and providing information to districts and parents about the December 2004 revisions to IDEA and for developing forms for district use in meeting the new requirements. These tasks may have impacted unfavorably on their ability to resolve complaints within time limits.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100%
2006 (2006-2007)	100%
2007 (2007-2008)	100%
2008 (2008-2009)	100%
2009 (2009-2010)	100%
2010 (2010-2011)	100%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

The Complaint Workgroup has analyzed the data and determined that receipt of the district materials is critical in maintaining the 60-day timeline. The group determined that the letter sent to the school district acknowledging the complaint will be revised to specify a date by which materials are needed. WDPI will ensure complaint staff follows the internal complaint procedures for receiving information from the district when materials have not been received in a timely manner. Electronic reminders for the due date will be sent to complaint staff. Periodically and prior to the submission of each APR during the SPP period, WDPI will review the timeliness of compliant decisions to ensure timely decisions. If a complaint decision is not timely, WDPI will analyze the reasons to determine appropriate corrective actions.

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to the overview section, pages 1-5.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 17: Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

Percent = $(3.2(a) + 3.2(b))$ divided by (3.2) times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

When a hearing is requested, the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI), by contract with the Department of Administration--Division of Hearings and Appeals (DHA), appoints an impartial hearing officer to conduct the hearing. Hearing officers are attorneys who receive initial, and at least annual, training from WDPI regarding special education requirements. Except in cases requiring an expedited hearing, the hearing officer must issue a written decision based solely upon the evidence presented at the hearing within 45 days following completion of the 30-day resolution session period. The hearing officer may extend the 45-day timeline, for cause, if the parent or the school district requests an extension. The vast majority of hearing requests have been settled informally or by settlement agreements rather than by hearing officers' decisions. The hearing decision notifies the parties that under state law, within 45 days after the administrative law judge's decision has been issued, either party may appeal the decision to the circuit court for the county in which the child resides or to federal district court.

Since 1996, WDPI has contracted with DHA to complete IDEA due process hearings. DHA maintains an electronic tracking system which monitors decision due dates. The system tracks extensions of the initial 45-day time limit and the dates when the hearing is to occur and the decision is due. This information is available to each hearing officer. WDPI has maintained an electronic log of critical information related to receipt of due process hearing requests for many years. The information includes elements such as the names of the parties, filing date, initial 45-day time limit, dates of extensions and date of the decision. During the year department staff also track hearing due dates. In preparing reports to OSEP, department staff confer with DHA staff prior to reporting the timeliness of completed due process hearings. For several years, including for each annual performance report (APR), WDPI has determined that all hearings were held within required time limits.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

See attachment 1.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

All four fully adjudicated due process hearing requests resulted in decisions within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that was properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100%
2006 (2006-2007)	100%
2007 (2007-2008)	100%
2008 (2008-2009)	100%
2009 (2009-2010)	100%
2010 (2010-2011)	100%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

WDPI will maintain the 100% compliance reported in current and previous reporting periods utilizing WDPI's and DHA's electronic tracking systems and through continuing coordination with DHA staff.

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to the overview section, pages 1-5.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision
--

Indicator 18: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B))

Measurement:

Percent = 3.1(a) divided by (3.1) times 100.
--

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

This is a new indicator for which the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) must collect data.

WDPI has collected in electronic log critical information related to due process hearing requests for many years. The information includes elements such as the names of the parties, filing date, initial 45-day time limit and date of the decision. WDPI has modified this log to capture the information required for this data element. When the hearing file is returned to WDPI by the Department of Administration--Division of Hearings and Appeals (DHA), which conducts the hearings, WDPI staff will review the file to locate information needed to accurately report indicator #18. Discussions have been held with administrators at the DHA regarding maintaining this information. WDPI anticipates that in nearly all instances the returned file will have required information. If additional information is required, WDPI staff will contact district staff and, as necessary, the parent to complete the log entry. WDPI staff will work closely with DHA staff during the current school year to ensure that required data is available in the returned file.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005): N/A

Discussion of Baseline Data: N/A

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	N/A
2006 (2006-2007)	N/A
2007 (2007-2008)	N/A
2008 (2008-2009)	N/A
2009 (2009-2010)	N/A
2010 (2010-2011)	N/A

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources: N/A

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to the overview section, pages 1-5.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 19: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

Percent = $(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) \div (2.1) \times 100$.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) provides mediation, as a dispute resolution option, through the Wisconsin Special Education Mediation System (WSEMS). WSEMS is directed by three partners: the Director of the Marquette University Center for Dispute Resolution Education, a Special Education Director for a cooperative educational service agency (CESA), and a Co-Director of a Parent Training and Information Center. WSEMS maintains a list of mediators who are from a wide range of professional backgrounds. Each mediator is required to complete five days of training on special education mediation and annually to complete an additional day of training. The system also provides a facilitated individualized education program (IEP) meeting process. Mediation and the IEP meeting facilitation are provided at no cost to the parties. Participants are requested to complete a survey following the mediations. Survey data consistently indicates that participants are overwhelmingly satisfied with the mediation process.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

For the 2004-2005 federal fiscal year, 88% of mediations held resulted in a mediation agreement. See attachment 1 for baseline data for the 2004-2005 year.

Data Source: WSEMS

Discussion of Baseline Data:

For the 2004-2005 year, there were 66 cases that went to mediation. Sixteen of the mediated cases related to due process. Of those 16 cases, 15 resulted in a mediation agreement. Fifty of the mediated cases were not related to due process. Of those 50 cases, 43 resulted in a mediation agreement. Thus, for the 2004-2005 federal fiscal year, 88% of mediations held resulted in mediation agreements. The percentage was calculated using the formula for measurement of indicator #19.

The targets for this indicator were unanimously decided by the continuous improvement and focused monitoring system (CIMFS) stakeholders. In setting the targets, the stakeholders were concerned that setting the target rates too high might result in coercive tactics which would undermine the voluntary nature of mediation. Stakeholders recognized that this voluntary or self-determination component is essential to a successful mediation system. Furthermore, stakeholders relied on input from Eva Soeka, a mediation system partner and the Director of the Marquette University Center for Dispute Resolution Education. Professor Soeka, in a memorandum provided to stakeholders, states that "[h]igh target rates send a message to mediators that they are expected to 'get a settlement' if they are to be viewed favorably by the system's administration. This type of implicit pressure violates the Model Standards of Mediators." Stakeholders also relied on guidance from OSEP in the document titled "Part B State Performance Plan Questions and Answers," which directed states to look at previous annual performance report (APR) attachments to set targets. Stakeholders reviewed targets in previous APR attachments and settlement rates for the previous five school years. For the 2002-2003 reporting period, the target was a settlement range which began at 65%. This was increased to 75% for the 2003-2004, and 2004-

2005 reporting periods. The stakeholders began with the 75% target rate, and increased it to 80% over the six-year period.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	At least 75% of mediations held will result in mediation agreements.
2006 (2006-2007)	At least 76% of mediations held will result in mediation agreements.
2007 (2007-2008)	At least 77% of mediations held will result in mediation agreements.
2008 (2008-2009)	At least 78% of mediations held will result in mediation agreements.
2009 (2009-2010)	At least 79% of mediations held will result in mediation agreements.
2010 (2010-2011)	At least 80% of mediations held will result in mediation agreements.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Wisconsin's Special Education Mediation System is recognized as a national model by the Consortium for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education (CADRE). WSEMS partners have been requested to present information on this model at national conferences throughout the United States.

To maintain the success of the mediation system, mediators receive annual training each spring. Mediators further receive continuous technical assistance through contact with the Marquette University Center for Dispute Resolution Education, through an online informational service, and through professional development opportunities. Awareness of Wisconsin's mediation system is made available through trainings conducted by the partners, brochures (with translations in Spanish and Hmong), and websites. Surveys are used in collecting data about the system, which is subsequently analyzed by a research methodologist. These surveys, which measure such things as participant satisfaction and issue trends, are reviewed and procedures revised as necessary. Survey data for the 2004-2005 operating year indicates, for example, that 88% percent of participants were satisfied with mediation, and 90% of participants would use mediation again. Continual evaluation of the mediation system through these surveys will ensure that the WSEMS will remain effective and will continue to meet its targets as well as other measures of a successful system.

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Refer to the overview section, pages 1-5.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 20: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

State reported data, including 618 data and annual performance reports, are:

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity, placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports); and
- b. Accurate (describe mechanisms for ensuring accuracy).

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction's (WDPI) data collection procedures have been revised to improve the accuracy of federal data reports and the timely submission of all reports. See the discussion of the baseline data and the improvement activities below for more information about the mechanisms implemented to ensure accuracy.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):**Measurements:**

A) Submission: All IDEA Part B federal data reports were submitted on or before the due dates during the 2004-05 baseline reporting period.

B) Accuracy: WDPI's Federal Student Data Report (also known as the December 1 count) collects individual student records which form the basis of the Child Count, FAPE, and Exiting special education data reports submitted to OSEP. A new internet application was launched in 2002 to replace the diskette collection system. This application was designed to improve the accuracy and efficiency of the federal data collection. It has proven popular with local educational agencies (LEAs) and has eliminated common problems inherent in the old diskette system.

Each year, WDPI staff offer training on federal data collection at inservice meetings sponsored by software vendors. Hundreds of LEA staff from across the state attend the trainings. Annually, WDPI staff review and update directions and software for the Federal Student Data Report and post it to the special education team website.

After all data submitted by districts for the December 1 count is received, a report showing the potential duplicate reporting of students is created based on similar name, gender and birth date matches. LEAs are contacted and asked to resolve duplicate reporting in February/March of each year. In addition, many edits are incorporated into the software focusing on educational environments.

In the data reporting process for the December 1 count, districts must account for all non-exiting students reported in the preceding year as either continuing or exited. Any discrepancies are referred to the district to resolve.

WDPI is moving to an individual student enrollment system (ISES) for all children in Wisconsin public schools. ISES will use a unique student identification number for every student which will allow a cohort of children with and without disabilities to be tracked over time. This data should enable staff to gather more reliable data on how children with disabilities perform or improve as compared to their nondisabled peers.

Special Education Plan (SEP): In school years 2000-01 through 2005-06, all of the LEAs in Wisconsin (including charter school LEAs) have annually completed a special education plan and submitted it to the WDPI for review. The SEP consists of three parts that the LEA must complete with parent participation and involvement. Part I of the SEP includes relevant statistical information drawn from other WDPI data reports that the district must analyze; Part II is a narrative section that requires the LEA to describe its educational delivery system, parent involvement, Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) efforts, referrals, and services for children with disabilities enrolled in private schools. Part III of the SEP is the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) flow-through and preschool entitlement grants application section. At the heart of the local SEP analyses are the ten data elements (115.77(4) (j) 1-10, Wis. Stats.) that the LEA must evaluate and report its findings, including whether improvements are needed. To assist this determination WDPI provides cut scores to districts indicating whether their own data deviate from state averages. If deviations are significant, the plan must be amended to describe the district's plan for improvement.

The data elements the district must analyze are:

1. Graduation rates for students with disabilities compared to those for students without disabilities;
2. Suspension and expulsion rates for students with disabilities compared to those without disabilities;
3. LEAs overall incidence rates of students with disabilities and the incidence rates of particular disabilities;
4. Rate of participation of students with disabilities in statewide and local assessments and the results of the assessments;
5. Rate of participation in alternative assessment and the results of those assessments;
6. The number of referrals and the percentage of those resulting in provision of special education and related services;
7. The number of children with disabilities placed in appropriate, interim, alternative educational settings;
8. General information about the satisfaction of parents of students with disabilities and adult pupils who are receiving special education and related services;
9. General information about persons who are no longer attending high school and who received special education and related services by the LEA, such as whether they are employed, living independently and/or enrolled in postsecondary education;
10. The number of students with disabilities who attend the district under open enrollment.

The SEP is submitted annually to WDPI and is reviewed by an SEP consultant assigned to the LEA. The plan is reviewed for completeness, issues related to the provision of a free appropriate public education, personally identifiable information and potential budgetary concerns. When concerns are identified, the SEP consultant contacts the LEA and requires the plan be amended. In addition, suspension and expulsion data receive additional scrutiny (see this information under the SEP section in indicator #4). When approved, the local SEP is posted to the WDPI website for public review.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

WDPI has met all deadlines for submitting IDEA Part B federal data reports for many years and will continue to do so. The implementation of ISES as described above, as well as the ongoing improvement activities described below, will ensure the data submitted is accurate.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100%
2006 (2006-2007)	100%
2007 (2007-2008)	100%
2008 (2008-2009)	100%
2009 (2009-2010)	100%
2010 (2010-2011)	100%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:Data Verification Workgroup

WDPI created a Data Verification Workgroup to examine educational environment data and trends over the past three years. The workgroup provided extensive training for directors of special education and data entry personnel on the "Accurate Reporting of Environment Code Data." The workgroup also developed a data verification protocol with the assistance of the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) staff for school-age environment data and piloted the process.

In November 2004, the workgroup produced a statewide Wisline (online) training to increase local district personnel's understanding of the early childhood and school-age environmental codes. The training stressed the importance of data accuracy and provided participants with working examples. A Powerpoint presentation of the training was subsequently posted on WDPI's website to serve as a resource for all school districts.

The workgroup is currently modifying and adapting the Appendix B Verification questions from OSEP's Continuous Improvement and Focused Monitoring System (CIFMS) Accountability manual to use at a local agency level. This effort begins with the collection and reporting of data under section 618 of the IDEA. The workgroup will pilot the adapted Appendix B accountability protocols in two local education agencies in 2006 and will expand the visits to additional school districts in 2007-2011.

Statewide Discretionary Projects

The state superintendent awards IDEA discretionary funds annually to school districts and CESAs to carry out statewide systems change projects on behalf of the WDPI. The project described below was one of the grants funded in the last year.

Data Retreats

During the 2003-2004 SY, WDPI in collaboration with Cooperative Educational Service Agencies (CESAs) #7 and #5, developed the Special Education Data Retreat Model to provide a unique, structured forum where collaborative teams of special educators, administrators, along with regular educators evaluated their systems for design and delivery of special education and related services. Focused data analysis enabled educators to develop internal accountability leading toward the development of school/district plans to address identified needs and improve student outcomes. The data includes graduation, dropout, suspension, expulsion, participation and performance on statewide assessments, and educational environments. Data is disaggregated by disability area, gender, and race/ethnicity whenever it is available. Based upon the CESA #7 Data Retreat Model, teams of educators attend a two-day special education data retreat and participate in an eight-step facilitated participatory data analysis process. During the 2004-2005 school year (SY), statewide training was provided to give all Wisconsin school districts the opportunity to analyze their own data by a collaborative staff team, to identify areas of need based on the data analysis and to work towards a plan to address those needs building/district wide. To accomplish this statewide training, a "Train the Trainers" model was used. A two-day facilitated training was conducted for all Regional Service Network (RSN) Directors and School Improvement Service (SIS) Directors in the state. A model set of data was used for training purposes. After the RSN and SIS Directors were trained, each CESA conducted trainings for their own school districts. Two follow-up meetings were conducted to provide support and technical assistance to those responsible for conducting special education data retreats.

(http://www.cesa7.k12.wi.us/schoolimprove/networks/SIS_network/data_retreats_2002.htm)

See indicator #12 for more information about data improvement activities.

Report of Dispute Resolution Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Complaints, Mediations, Resolution Sessions, and Due Process Hearings

SECTION A: Signed, written complaints	
(1) Signed, written complaints total	66
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued	61
(a) Reports with findings	45
(b) Reports within timeline	50
(c) Reports within extended timelines	1
(1.2) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed	5
(1.3) Complaints pending	0
(a) Complaint pending a due process hearing	0

SECTION B: Mediation requests	
(2) Mediation requests total	95
(2.1) Mediations	
(a) Mediations related to due process	16
(i) Mediation agreements	15
(b) Mediations not related to due process	50
(i) Mediation agreements	43
(2.2) Mediations not held (including pending)	29

SECTION C: Hearing requests	
(3) Hearing requests total	34
(3.1) Resolution sessions	No 04-05 Data
(a) Settlement agreements	No 04-05 Data
(3.2) Hearings (fully adjudicated)	4
(a) Decisions within timeline	4
(b) Decisions within extended timeline	0
(3.3) Resolved without a hearing	25

SECTION D: Expedited hearing requests (related to disciplinary decision)	
(4) Expedited hearing requests total	0
(4.1) Resolution sessions	No 04-05 Data
(a) Settlement agreements	No 04-05 Data
(4.2) Expedited hearings (fully adjudicated)	0
(a) Change of placement ordered	0